our entreaties have fallen upon deaf ears. The end result is that we have had cordial, business-like meetings but the drive for hard-metric concrete block continues unabated. The federal procurement policy officials keep telling block manufacturers to make hard-metric block or they won't be adequately responding to federal solicitations.

We have been told point-blank that if companies have to go by the wayside in order to convert to hard-metric, so be it, that is the price of progress.

It is clear to me that the only solution at this point is a legislative solution.

On behalf of united C/M producers throughout the country, I would urge that you and your colleagues pass legislation to restore the original intent of Congress and prevent the terrible, ironic consequences that the hard-metric conversion of concrete masonry would create.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

RANDALL G. PENCE,
Director of Government Relations.

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 I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996 MIDDLE EAST FACILITATION ACT OF 1995—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have before the Senate this morning the conference report on the foreign operations bill. This measure passed the House yesterday at 351 to 71.

I might just say before what I hope will be just a brief debate, I am not currently aware of any other Senators on this side of the aisle who wish to speak. Senator LEAHY should be here momentarily and it is our hope that we could have fairly early on here a rollcall vote on the conference report itself.

There is an amendment in disagreement related to the abortion issue which may take a little more debate and then a vote a little bit later. But it is our hope, and if there are no objections or problems with that, that we might be able to get to a vote on the conference report rather soon.

Let me say, although we had very limited resources, I believe this bill legislates our national priorities—it provides both security and flexibility.

The conferees produced legislation below our allocation, $1.5 billion below last year's levels and nearly $2.7 billion below what President Clinton requested. So clearly we have made a reduction in foreign assistance.

In spite of these reductions, our security interests have been clearly served by earmarking funds for our Camp David partners and extending the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act.

We also advance our national security priorities in the New Independent States by completing a shift in resources from Russia to Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, and the other States that used to be part of the Soviet Union.

We have also linked aid to Russia to termination of the nuclear deal with Iran. In the interest of maximizing the administration's leverage, I suggested the restriction take effect 3 months after the date of enactment of this bill giving the Vice President the opportunity to negotiate a solution to this problem in his January meetings with Chernomydin.

We have served U.S. interests while affording the administration a great deal of flexibility.

There are three ways we have offered flexibility.

First, we have provided transfer authority between accounts. For example, NIS resources can be used to fund the Warsaw Initiative and Partnership for Peace programs. Second, we have consolidated various development aid accounts into one account with limited conditions; and, third, there are very few earmarks.

I think the House would have preferred to provide a blank check giving the administration the option to make all funding choices, but after 3 years of unfulfilled commitments, the conferees agreed upon the necessity to set funding levels for specific countries, which was, of course, the imprint of the Senate bill.

For my colleagues who are concerned about earmarking resources for specific projects, let me assure them we have avoided such action. We have funded countries and categories of activities such as programs to strengthen democracy, rule of law and independent media, but have not dedicated any resources for any organization or project within these broad accounts.

The conference report largely reflects the priorities identified by the Senate. The conferees agreed to the Senate's provisions on a range of issues from Pakistan to an amendment offered by Senator HELMS to ban AID's move to the Federal triangle.

One of the few items where the Senate position did not prevail concerns Mexico City and funding for abortion. We are reporting back an amendment in disagreement which I would like to take a moment to explain.

The House passed language which banned assistance to any organization which fails to certify that they are not performing abortions. In addition, the House banned assistance to the UNFPA unless the President certified programs in China had been terminated.

The Senate stripped out the language at the subcommittee level and substituted language requiring the same standards for determining eligibility for assistance be applied to both governments and to nongovernmental and multilateral organizations. The senate also required no funds be used to lobby on the question of abortion.

Unfortunately the conferees were unable to reach any agreement on this matter.

Fundamentally, let me just say that the Senate appears to be narrowly prochoice, as these terms generally describe positions Senators have taken. The House appears to be prolife. So we were unable to come together in the conference report.

The House has sent over a substitute measure which restricts assistance to organizations which provide abortions but makes exceptions where the life of the mother, rape or incest are involved—a solution which tracks the so-called Hyde standards. The compromise also includes language which requires the President to certify that the UNFPA will terminate programs in China compared with the previous language requiring the President to certify that UNFPA already has terminated China programs. My understanding is this distinction was drawn because UNFPA plans to cease China programs at the end of this calendar year, thus it is a standard the administration could meet.

I hope my colleagues will support the conference report as it is entirely consistent with the votes and views of the Senate expressed September 21. It is my intention to also support the compromise language proposed by the House in the amendment in disagreement since I believe it is consistent with language which the Congress has been able to support in the past. But, clearly, Mr. President, it is a statement of the obvious to say that is an issue upon which the Senate and the House are deeply divided.

With regard to the abortion issue, the vote, I would just report to my colleagues—I think I said earlier the vote on the full conference report in the House yesterday was 351 in favor, 71 against. On the abortion amendment in disagreement, in the House the vote was 231 in favor of the House position, which I have just outlined; 187 against.

So, at some point during the day we will have a vote on the conference report and then a vote on the amendment in disagreement. It is my hope, as I indicated earlier, that we can have a vote on the conference report sometime very soon. I believe Senator LEAHY is on his way and I did want to give notice to everyone there could well be a rollcall vote on the conference report sometime very soon.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am grateful that the conferees have included my amendment to require the U.S. Agency for International Development to contract out mapping and surveying work to qualified U.S. companies when such work can be accomplished by the private sector. This provision was based on my concern that while AID requires mapping and surveying in countries that receive development assistance, this mapping and

surveying work is most often contracted out by AID to other government agencies. In many instances Federal agencies are aggressively marketing their mapping capabilities to foreign governments, and through AID, in direct competition with qualified U.S. companies. Despite language in previous committee reports, the amount of U.S. private sector contracting for such services has not increased.

The purpose of this amendment is to move the mapping and surveying requirements of AID to private U.S. firms. Under current Federal policy on such commercial activities, if an activity has not been justified by the provider agency—like the U.S. Geological Survey—for continued in-house performance, AID shall obtain the required services directly from a commercial source. No agency has performed the requisite commercial activities study to justify in-house performance in mapping and surveying, so this provision is a clarification to enforce the existing policy of the Federal Government to rely on, and not compete with, the private sector pursuant to the Office of Management and Budget circular A–76.

I would like to clarify one point with regard to the intent of this provision, and to ask my good friend from Kentucky and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee chairman, Senator MCCONNELL, if this is his understanding of this AID mapping and surveying amendment language? Specifically, it is not the intent of this provision to change Federal procurement law or the Federal Acquisition Regulations. Although the language in the amendment uses the word ''bidding,'' contracts for mapping and surveying services should be awarded to qualified U.S. firms in accordance with the standard and accepted procedure for such services found in 40 U.S.C. 541 et seq. and section 36.601–4(a)(4) of the Federal Acquisition Regulations. This amendment provides for increased contracting out of mapping and surveying services by AID, using the normal qualifications based selection process. Does the Senator from Kentucky concur with this clarification?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senator Stevens, thank you for defining this wording of the AID mapping and surveying amendment, and, yes, I concur in this clarification.

Mr. STEVENS. I think the Senator from Kentucky.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have before us, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said, the foreign operations conference report. It is not the conference report I would have liked to have written as a bill. I suspect it is probably not precisely the conference report that the Senator from Kentucky would have liked to have written. It is, however, the best that we could do in not only a very difficult budget climate but one in which there are probably more tugs and pulls, philosophical, ideological, and policy, on the Committee on Foreign Operations than I have seen in many a year.

The bill, incidentally, is $130 million below the level that was passed overwhelmingly, by a 5-to-1 margin, in the Senate on September 21. I wish in this case we could have maintained the Senate level because it is a very small price to pay for American leadership abroad. We find we can easily spend billions and billions of dollars going in either as peacekeeping forces or military forces when there are troubles abroad, but we cannot spend a tiny, tiny fraction of that to help avoid those troubles beginning in the first place.

I do wish to commend Senator MCCONNELL for his efforts to get this bill through the conference and to the President's desk. We had a very lengthy meeting. I think we went to about midnight or so on our committee of conference ironing out all but the one issue, the issue that is before this body in true disagreement, and in fact in this case that is on international family planning. I will have an amendment to reinstate the Senate position. I will do that for myself and for Senator KASSEBAUM and for others, and to go back to the Senate position. I will do that after we pass the conference report, which I fully expect will be passed.

That amendment, which I will then offer, will simply reaffirm what the Senate is already on record doing. In fact, the President has made it very clear that he will veto this bill unless we fix this one provision, the item that is in disagreement.

So in this case we did the best we could. I feel that we are not meeting many of our international commitments, and I would just close with this thought. We all take great joy at seeing the cold war ending. Every one of us, if we travel abroad, like saying we are Americans, without saying it here at home. The fact is we are the most powerful nation history has ever known. We are the largest economy history has ever known. But with that comes certain responsibilities. Frankly, we have backed off on these responsibilities worldwide. Other countries have picked up on them.

Japan spends not only as part of their budget but more in actual dollars in areas of foreign aid than we do. That is not all done out of altruism. They have found that as they have helped the economies of a number of developing countries, these developing countries then buy goods from Japan; their exports go up while our exports are going down. They create more jobs in Japan while we lose jobs in America. Why? Because they are willing to invest in the future economies of some of these countries. We do not want to invest the pennies in the future economies of some of these countries even though it creates dollars and dollars and dollars here in the United States. We do not want to spend the pennies to create some of the jobs and the economic benefits in some of these developing countries even though we will create far more jobs in the United States, even though all of us know that as exports go up it is one of the single greatest boons to our economy here in the United States.

Instead, we let this export business go to other countries. We let these jobs go to other countries. We do not show that kind of leadership.

We are not doing enough to stop wars and internal struggles worldwide even though we know that we will get sucked into them eventually and spend a heck of a lot more after the fact. It is kind of like preventive medicine. We do not want to spend the money on preventive medicine but, by gosh, we come in with troops to take care of the costs in the emergency room afterward. Well, there are going to be a lot of emergency rooms worldwide, and the most powerful nation on Earth is going to be called upon. Maybe we ought to start doing a little preventive medicine. It is going to cost us a lot less in the long run. It is going to be far more important to our national security, and it is going to improve our own economy.

With that, Mr. President, I would ask for the regular order.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the conference report accompanying H.R. 1868, the foreign operations and export financing appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The final bill provides $12.1 billion in budget authority and $5.9 billion in new outlays to finance the Nation's foreign assistance programs.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the bill totals $12.2 billion in budget authority and $13.9 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1996.

The subcommittee is within its section 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. The bill is $84.4 million in budget authority under the subcommittee 602(b) allocation and at the outlay allocation.

I commend the conferees for supporting the North American Development Bank in the final bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the budget

committee scoring of the final bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE SPENDING TOTALS—CONFERENCE REPORT

[Fiscal year 1996, in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	68	7,950
H.R. 1868, conference report	12,060	5,892
Scorekeeping adjustment	.....	.....
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	12,128	13,842
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	.....
H.R. 1868, conference report	44	44
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget Resolution assumptions	0	0
Subtotal mandatory	44	44
Adjusted bill total	12,172	13,886
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	.....	.....
Nondefense discretionary	12,212	13,842
Violent crime reduction trust fund	.....	.....
Mandatory	44	44
Total allocation	12,256	13,886
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	.....	.....
Nondefense discretionary	−84	−0
Violent crime reduction trust fund	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....
Total allocation	−84	−0

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I intend to vote for passage of the conference report to H.R. 1868, the foreign operations appropriations bill. I do so because there are a number of vitally important provisions in this legislation, chief among them being the extension of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. I share the concerns of many of my colleagues regarding Palestinian compliance with the peace accords, and will continue to follow this issue with great interest. With this bill, the American taxpayer once again is investing in what all hope to be a historic and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is up to us here in Congress to be sure that it is a wise investment, and that the conditions that brought about it are met.

I must confess I will vote in favor of this bill with great reluctance. I am very disappointed that the House and Senate conferees agreed to keep in the bill Senate language that would repeal a portion of Federal law that prohibits United States aid to Pakistan as long as the President fails to certify that Pakistan is not in possession of a nuclear explosive device—a law otherwise known as the Pressler amendment. The provision in H.R. 1868 would allow nonmilitary aid to resume to Pakistan, and would authorize the President to transfer $370 million in military equipment sought by Pakistan but not delivered because of the Pressler sanctions. By including this provision, this Congress has put the American taxpayer back in the business of subsidizing a nuclear program that this Nation does not recognize under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NNPT]. Even worse, today the U.S. Congress has sent a chilling message: Nuclear proliferation pays.

This is a frustrating day, Mr. President. Ten years ago, the U.S. Congress passed the Pressler amendment. In so doing, we made it clear that the United States could not condone, through foreign aid, Pakistan's drive for the bomb. It was our hope that the leverage of foreign aid would deter Pakistan from developing nuclear weapons. If it did not, it was important from the standpoint of nonproliferation that the United States not subsidize Pakistan's nuclear program. That was the purpose behind the Pressler amendment.

By and large, the Pressler amendment has worked. First, though never verified, Pakistan claims it has ceased developing weapons grade enriched uranium. Second, the threat of Pressler sanctions has deterred a number of states that pursued active nuclear weapons research programs in the 1980's, including Argentina, Brazil, South Korea, Taiwan, and South Africa. This successful track record now risks being reversed.

I have expressed my strong concerns on this issue in this Chamber already in great detail. I will not repeat them here. The bottom line is clear: Our Nation's nonproliferation policy is in serious jeopardy, and it is not just with respect to the Pressler amendment. We have heard many reports that the communist Chinese have shipped M–11 related missile technology to both Pakistan and Iran in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. Under a law I drafted, the President has presumptive authority to impose sanctions against the responsible parties in China if he has reason to believe an MTCR violation has occurred. Yet, the President is unwilling to exercise that authority. Further, the current House and Senate versions of the intelligence authorization bill contain language that would give the President unprecedented discretion to waive U.S. nonproliferation laws.

Mr. President, just last year, the President stated that no foreign policy issue was more important to the security of all people than nuclear nonproliferation. Yet, the current administration is engineering an unprecedented rollback in U.S. nonproliferation laws and policies. The administration's actions do not match its rhetoric. This demonstration of doublethink would be very humorous if the issue was not so very serious.

For those of us in Congress who have devoted many years on nonproliferation issues, these recent developments are very disturbing. As the world's sole remaining superpower, the signatories of the NNPT look to us to set the example and enforce the rules. Yet, today, we are changing the rules of the nuclear nonproliferation game to benefit one proliferator. This is the worst possible message we could send to those nations who have played by the rules.

PAKISTAN PROVISION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Foreign Operations Conference Report, but I do so with regret because of the provision in this bill relating to Pakistan.

There is much in this conference report that I support, and which I believe the conferees have every right to be proud of.

The bill maintains our assistance to Israel and Egypt, sending a message of the United States' firm support of our allies in the Middle East, and our encouragement of their efforts to achieve a comprehensive peace.

The bill extends the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act by 18 months, allowing the President to continue to provide assistance to the Palestinians and conduct relations with the PLO, while requiring strict compliance by the PLO and the Palestinian Authority with all of their commitments. This is a further demonstration of U.S. support for the peace process.

The bill provides assistance for Armenia, Ukraine, and other former Soviet republics to help ensure that democracy takes hold, and the assistance to Russia is appropriately conditioned on Russian cooperation with the United States in various areas.

The bill significantly increases the budget for international narcotics programs, demonstrating that controlling the scourge of the international drug trade is among our Nation's highest international priorities.

Unfortunately, included in the conference report with all these positive provisions is a provision that I think is extremely dangerous. The House conferees agreed to adopt the Senate language on Pakistan, which was added to the bill as a Brown amendment. Among other things, this provision allows the President to transfer to Pakistan some $368 million worth of sophisticated military equipment at a time when Pakistan is still committed to pursuing weapons of mass destruction.

I realize that we have debated this issue at length, but the objections to this provision bear repeating.

Sanctions were invoked against Pakistan in 1990 because President Bush could not certify that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear explosive device. Nothing has changed since that time. To this day, neither President Bush nor President Clinton has been able to make such a certification.

Pakistan's commitment to continuing its nuclear program makes it wholly inappropriate—even irresponsible—for the Congress to authorize the release to Pakistan of a significant package of sophisticated military equipment.

I realize that this provision has the support of the administration, but I must say that in advocating this proposal, the administration is also acting irresponsibly. An administration that says that nonproliferation is one of its

highest international priorities should not be transferring weapons to Pakistan until Pakistan has made vast improvements on the nonproliferation front.

There is a further concern about transferring these weapons. The package of equipment may not be significant enough to substantially alter the military balance in the region, but it is enough to exacerbate an unstable political situation. The political symbolism of the returning equipment will be handing a propaganda victory to the extremist Indian opposition heading in next spring's elections.

The Indian Government is already coming under intense domestic pressure to respond to the transfer of these weapons. I very much fear that India will respond by deploying their Prithvi missile, which could launch a bona fide ballistic missile race in South Asia. Pakistan might well respond by deploying the M–11s many believe they have acquired from China.

If this scenario plays itself out, the United States will be responsible for fueling an extremely dangerous arms race in one of the most unstable regions in the world.

Having said all this, I want to make two additional points. First, I want to urge the government and people of India not to overreact to this turn of events.

Indian politicians may exploit these weapons for their own gain and stoke the flames of paranoia in the pursuit of votes. But I want to urge the Government of India not to respond to this weapons transfer by significantly upgrading their military posture, and in particular, not to further escalate the arms race in South Asia.

Second, if we must transfer these weapons to Pakistan, we are entitled to expect something in return. As I have said in the past, I favor resuming nonmilitary assistance to Pakistan in order to expand our ability to cooperate on anti-terrorism activities, antinarcotics efforts, peacekeeping, environmental protection, and other areas. I consider those provisions of the Brown amendment to be helpful in enabling us to rebuild our troubled relationship with Pakistan.

But we have every right to expect improved cooperation from Pakistan, not only in these areas, but in nonproliferation as well. Pakistan's unfortunate record of developing nuclear weapons and seeking to acquire ballistic missile technology has exacerbated tensions and contributed to instability in South Asia. As we have in the past, I would urge Pakistan to reverse course and contribute to building a new, more stable South Asia.

Mr. President, I believe we have made a mistake with the passage of the entire Brown amendment. With the help of both India and Pakistan, we can help ensure that this mistake does not spawn other, even greater mistakes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the conference report? If not, the question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote ''yea.''

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] is absent because of illness in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 559 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Abraham	Feinstein	Lugar
Akaka	Ford	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Baucus	Glenn	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Gramm	Moynihan
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Boxer	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatch	Pell
Bumpers	Heflin	Pressler
Burns	Helms	Pryor
Campbell	Hutchison	Reid
Chafee	Inhofe	Robb
Coats	Inouye	Rockefeller
Cochran	Jeffords	Roth
Cohen	Johnston	Santorum
Conrad	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kennedy	Shelby
D'Amato	Kerrey	Simon
Daschle	Kerry	Simpson
DeWine	Kohl	Snowe
Dodd	Kyl	Specter
Dole	Lautenberg	Thomas
Domenici	Leahy	Thompson
Dorgan	Levin	Thurmond
Exon	Lieberman	Warner
Feingold	Lott	Wellstone

NAYS—6

Byrd	Faircloth	Kempthorne
Craig	Hollings	Smith

NOT VOTING—3

Bradley	Hatfield	Stevens

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment in disagreement, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

: Provided, That none of the funds available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTION

SEC. 518A. (a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to funds made available for a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or sub-grantee, and the required certifications apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or sub-grantee.

(d) COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than March 1, 1996; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term ''coercion'' includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

AMENDMENT NO. 3041

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment that I send to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself and Mrs. KASSEBAUM, proposes an amendment numbered 3041 to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 115.

Mr. LEAHY. 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:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: ''*: Provided,* That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, nongovernmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than the requirements applicable to

foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.''

Mr. LEAHY. I will yield to the Senator from Arizona in a moment. Just so that colleagues will understand what is happening here, the amendment that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] and I have sent to the desk is an amendment on the one amendment in disagreement. We resolved 192 out of the 193 amendments in the committee of conference. This is the one so-called Mexico City policy of the 1980's, one in disagreement.

After having been reported, it is open to second-degree amendment, which I understand the Senator from Arizona is going to make on an entirely different issue. But for those who have been asking me about the Mexico City policy, my understanding is what we would then do is debate the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, there would be a vote on that, and then we would begin the debate on the Mexico City amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3042 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3041

(Purpose: To permit the continued provision of assistance to Burma only if certain conditions are satisfied)

Mr. MCCAIN. I have a second degree perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for himself and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3042 to amendment No. 3041.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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:

At the end of the pending amendment add the following:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds made available in this Act may be used for international narcotics control assistance under chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or crop substitution assistance, directly for the Government of Burma if the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that any such programs are fully consistent with United States human rights concerns in Burma and serve a vital United States national interest. The President shall include in each annual International Narcotics Control Strategy Report submitted under section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)) a description of the programs funded under this section.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the manager of the bill, and with the Senator from Vermont. I do not believe this should take very much time.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment would modify the provision in the conference report that prohibits funding for international narcotics control assistance in Burma. The amendment would modify that prohibition by permitting such assistance only if the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that such programs are fully consistent with the United States human rights concerns in Burma, and that they serve a vital United States national interest.

I emphasize that the secretary must certify that a program such as this serves a vital U.S. national security interest.

That vital national interest is obvious, Mr. President. Sixty percent of the heroin that comes to this country originates in Burma—60 percent. We have a compelling, urgent responsibility to do whatever we can to eliminate or at least reduce Burma's export of that dangerous narcotic. Without a strategy that addresses the heroin trade in Burma, we have no effective antinarcotic program at all.

I can well understand the Senate's desire to influence the Burmese regime's treatment of the Burmese people. That treatment has been abominable and well deserves our severe reproach. I visited Burma last March and was exposed to a pretty representative sampling of how abominable that treatment has been and continues to be.

Daw Aung San Kyi's release was a very welcome development. But in and of itself it does not represent evidence of political reform or even an indication of progress toward an objective standard of human rights in Burma. Burma has a very long way to go.

I feel very strongly that the United States must actively support the cause of human freedom in Burma, and make it unmistakably clear to Burma's State Law and Order Restoration Council, the SLORC, that the United States, indeed, all of the civilized world expect them to begin respecting the will and the rights of the Burmese people.

But what I have difficulty understanding is why we must refrain from acting in our own national interest while we attempt to act in the interest of the Burmese people. I could understand the objective of this provision if it stated that no funds for drug control could be made available directly to the SLORC. I would not support this assistance either if the State Department were proposing to simply provide money to the SLORC with the promise that the SLORC would use it to eradicate poppy fields. It is quite probable that such funds would be used by the SLORC to further oppress ethnic minorities in Burma, like the Wa.

But, Mr. President, that is not what the administration proposes to do with this assistance. First, it is a relatively small amount of money that we are talking about, with most of it going to the efforts of the United Nations Drug Control Program [UNDCP] in Burma. Two million dollars would be provided to the U.N. to work with ethnic minorities on crop substitution and other programs intended to begin making some, although admittedly small, progress in reducing poppy cultivation. None of that assistance would be funneled through the SLORC.

A limited—a very limited amount of assistance, $50,000, I believe—would be provided to train Burmese customs officials. But I fail to see the harm in that, given that the amount is so small, and the need for better Burmese control of drug smuggling at the borders so obvious.

Mr. President, $2 million isn't going to solve America's heroin problem. But I do not see how we begin to get any control over that problem absent some kind of program in Burma.

Opium production in Burma has skyrocketed in recent years. It is, by far, the largest heroin producing country in the world. Again, 60 percent of heroin in the United States originates in Burma.

The enormous increase in heroin production globally has substantially reduced the street price of heroin while simultaneously increasing the purity, and, consequently, the lethality of the drug. Overdoses—fatal overdoses—have increased rapidly in the United States.

Sadly, as long as there is demand for heroin, we will never be able to keep it out of all our children's hands. But if in Burma and elsewhere our efforts make some progress in restricting the flow of heroin to the United States, we will make the drug more expensive and less readily available on our streets that it is today.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I should also add that in meetings attended by American Embassy officials in Rangoon, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Prize winner, clearly the leader of that nation, who has been a beacon of hope for freedom and democracy for the people of Burma and people of the world, whose stature is such that she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, and she, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, expressed her support for counternarcotics assistance to Burma. In fact, she maintained such assistance would not directly or indirectly help the SLORC to retain power and, on the contrary, might encourage the SLORC to make additional human rights concessions. For my part, her opinion should be what drives the decisions made here in the U.S. Senate. I think it is clearly sufficient justification to approve of this very modest antidrug program.

I am convinced that the counternarcotics assistance envisioned for Burma is consistent with our human rights goals in Burma. But I repeat, to ensure that it remains so, this amendment requires the Secretary to certify that all the programs which our assistance would support are fully consistent with our human rights concerns in Burma.

Mr. President, I believe, as we have in many other countries, the United

States can advance its values and protect our national interests in Burma simultaneously. They are not mutually exclusive and should not be treated so.

I understand the committee's motive for this provision. I must disagree with the means by which it hopes to achieve its objective. I hope Senators also disagree with those means and support the amendment to help in some small way reduce the flow of heroin to the streets of America.

Mr. President, this amendment is supported by the administration. This amendment is supported by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. I have no brief for the ruling junta of army officers that control Burma—their human rights record is despicable. If any of this money were going to help that organization, I would not be proposing it.

We started a war on drugs some years ago, and we have either declared unconditional surrender or we have forgotten about it. I do not know which. Whatever, there is an increase in the use of heroin in this country. There is an increase in the purity of that heroin. There are lethal overdoses that are being taken of that drug as we speak.

I believe that there are many ways to win the war on drugs. The primary one is to reduce the demand here at home. We also must attack the supply in whatever way we can.

I want to point out again, Mr. President, I probably would not have proposed this amendment if it had not been for the express support of this program by this remarkable, extraordinary woman, a woman who transcends human events, a woman who has suffered for her country, whose father was a martyr to an assassin's bullet as he was the leader of this poor country. Mr. President, if the person who clearly, if there were an election tomorrow, would win by an overwhelming majority, a landslide, were not in support of this amendment, I would not be proposing it, and I hope that the Members of this body will heed her words rather than anyone else's, including my own.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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, in July, Suu Kyi was released after 6 years under house arrest. It was the first glimmer of hope for Burma since the military crackdown in 1988. As she has repeatedly and emphatically stated since her release, nothing else has happened. She has been released and that is it. Burma is not one step closer to implementing the results of the elections of 1990.

Burmese citizens are still suffering at the hands of one of the worst police states in the world. In fact, since Suu Kyi was released, there have been more arrests, more Burmese men, women, and children have been forced from their homes into concentration camps, more villages have been burned to the ground by the government troops.

In fact, a recent Amnesty International report asserted unequivocally that the situation has dramatically deteriorated inside Burma in the last 2 months. Let me be clear, the situation has gotten worse since Suu Kyi's release.

Yet this is the very government that the amendment of my good friend from Arizona would have us cooperate with. Reasonable people can differ about how best to handle this situation, but I must say with all due respect to my good friend from Arizona, I see it a little differently. A government guilty of arbitrary detentions, torture, forced relocations, and killings is, it seems to me, a questionable government with which to deal.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Asia, Win Lord, shares this view. When I asked him what were the major impediments to an effective counternarcotics effort he said, ''What is gong to solve the problem over the long run is a popular, representative open government—all other efforts are minuscule compared to whether you have an open system there.'' I could not agree more with Secretary Lord's statement. A military junta, with an army of 350,000, assembled exclusively to terrorize its own people—they have no external threats, this army is to terrorize Burmese people—a military junta about which Assistant Secretary of State for Asian affairs, Winston Lord, has testified, ''The only impediment to cooperation on narcotics is their lack of interest.'' Their, meaning the SLORC.

Secretary Lord has testified we can only expect to see real cooperation on narcotics if democracy is restored. They had an election in 1990. The SLORC did not honor the election. Suu Kyi had been under house arrest since 1988, until this July. The situation has deteriorated since then. The question I guess we have before us is whether cooperation with this regime will produce a positive result. I am as concerned about the fact that 60 percent of the heroin coming into this country is coming from Burma as anyone else. It seems to me reasonable people can differ as to how to approach this problem, but I think we should be moving to isolate the military junta, rather than pursuing the amendment of my good friend from Arizona. That is why we should support the restoration of democracy and implement the results of the 1990 election.

Let me just conclude by noting that Suu Kyi has urged all nations to suspend investment in Burma, to take all steps possible to isolate this pariah regime. She opposes any efforts to legitimize this repressive regime.

My good friend from Arizona has argued that his amendment is not about cooperating with SLORC, but that is precisely what the State Department budget materials recommend. That is what the State Department is in effect recommending here. So it seems to me that is exactly what the State Department has in mind. They are seeking funds to train SLORC in counternarcotics efforts.

My good friend from Arizona has indicated that he believes Suu Kyi supports this cooperation. I know that is what the administration has represented as her position. The administration said Suu Kyi supports this approach.

But I might point out to my colleagues, to members of the House International Relations Committee who met with her, and in interviews with the international media, she has explicitly and repeatedly said she does not support cooperation with SLORC.

In fact, when she was advised the assistance we have provided had been used to attack ethnic groups on the border, I was advised she was horrified. It is the administration's interpretation of Suu Kyi's wishes that my colleague is relying upon, and I can understand his relying on the administration, I suppose. But there is substantial evidence, it seems to this Senator, that the administration is not correctly relating Suu Kyi's position to us. They are incorrectly characterizing her position.

There are others, including the international press and members of the House International Relations Committee, who have met with Suu Kyi and come to a different conclusion. So reasonable people here can differ.

I know my friend from Arizona's intentions are the best. He has been to Burma. He knows a lot about Southeast Asia. But it just seems to this Senator that cooperation with SLORC is not in our best interests. It seems to this Senator there are a number of people, both reporters and House Members, who have spoken with Suu Kyi who reached the conclusion that she would not favor this approach.

I simply hope the Senate will not go on record supporting the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. The issue of Burma is not going to go away. He is extremely knowledgeable about Burma, has very strong opinions about Burma. There are others of us who are also interested in what we might be able to do to bring about the end of SLORC and the return of democracy.

I hope we could all kind of sit down together and, not using this particular bill as a vehicle, sit down together and figure out what our best approach to Burma ought to be. With all due respect to my friend from Arizona, it seems to me cooperation with SLORC on drugs would be like cooperating with Iran on counterterrorism. It seems to me highly unlikely that this would be a productive relationship.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arizona will not be approved. I will make a motion to table when we

finish our debate. I understand we are going to be finishing up pretty quickly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I, like the distinguished chairman, cannot support the amendment and will join in his motion to table, not because I disagree with the Senator from Arizona in wanting to stop the flow of heroin from Burma. I totally agree with him in wanting to do that. I acknowledge his expertise in that part of the world. Anybody who has watched the evidence from the various law enforcement and international agencies knows of the tremendous flow of heroin from Burma. But I do not think this would stop it. In fact, I believe it will be money basically lost.

The SLORC itself is involved in the drug trade. They are an army that violates the human rights of their own people. They oppress their own people. They stop dissent in their own people. But, also, they take drug money themselves.

A U.N. program is not going to make any measurable difference. We are dealing with an outlaw government. We should not be doing something that might suggest that we accept this government in any way. These are drug dealers and thugs. They themselves are profiting from something we would be asking them to stop. So, while I will be happy to look at other areas when this bill next comes up, or any other bill, I will not support this.

I might also say I hope, having cleared 192 out of 193 amendments in disagreement, that we might be able to send back to the other body just one amendment in disagreement, something that will be debated and voted on following the debate and vote on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, a cable sent back from the State Department, which I have a copy of, concerned a long interview that took place with Aung San Suu Kyi on July 14 of this year. I quote:

Speaking to the Richardson-Rohrabacher amendment seeking to bar any USG drug control assistance to Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi disapproved, opining that, while the ''stick'' of impending trade sanctions had been useful in prompting her release, offering USG counternarcotics assistance to the SLORC would be a useful ''carrot'' to encourage additional progress.

The SLORC's desire to benefit from the political legitimacy accompanying USG drug control aid is well known, pointed out the NLD leader. She cited exchange of information and training as two specific types of counternarcotics assistance she could envision occurring now.

By the way, I ask unanimous consent the entire cable be printed in the RECORD.

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

SANCTIONS AND DRUG CONTROL AID DISCUSSED

NLD LEADER SEES DRUG CONTROL AID AS USEFUL ''CARROT''

11. Speaking to the Richardson-Rohrabacher amendment seeking to bar any USG drug control assistance to Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi disapproved, opining that, while the ''stick'' of impending trade sanctions had been useful in prompting her release, offering USG counternarcotics assistance to the SLORC would be a useful ''carrot'' to encourage additional progress.

The SLORC's desire to benefit from the political legitimacy accompanying USG drug control aid is well known, pointed out the NLD leader. She cited exchange of information and training as two specific types of counternarcotics assistance she could envision occurring now. While the SLORC would appreciate this aid, it would not improve the regime's staying power.

12. Berkowitz expressed concern that an exchange of information on drug traffickers and operations with the Burmese authorities might hurt the Wa, who are poor farmers with no alternative other than poppy cultivation. Suu Kyi clarified that the type of information she was taking about would not be that which could be used to attack harmless people. Rather, information on drug traffickers' movements would assist Burmese officials in locating and interdicting drug operations.

She turned to Tin 00, calling him an expert on the Wa, and asked him for expanded views on this issue. Tin 00 noted that poor Wa might be hurt, but added that the exchange of information on areas of poppy cultivation would be good, though the government may not take action against poppy cultivation in ethnic areas even when provided precise information on their location. Aung San Suu Kyi did not seem unduly worried when Berkowitz raised, the possibility that drug control efforts in the Wa area might alienate Wa farmers who depend on drug production for their sustenance.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, unless misinformation—and perhaps it is—is being conveyed from our Embassy in Burma, I think it is pretty clear what Aung San Suu Kyi's position is on this issue.

Also, let me point out, as I did in my opening statement, I do not support any money going through the Burmese Government known as SLORC. This money would not go through the Burmese Government known as SLORC. It specifically would be provided to the United Nations to work with ethnic minorities on crop substitution and other programs intended to begin making some, although admittedly small, progress in reducing poppy cultivation. None of that assistance would be funneled through the Government.

So I am sorry the Senator from Vermont either is misinformed or did not pay attention to what I had to say; perhaps both.

But the fact is that this money would not—I repeat, not—go through the settlement. If it would go through the Burmese Government, then I am convinced Aung San San Suu Kyi would not approve of it. After all, she is the one spent 4 years under house arrest and was a martyr who watched her countrymen be slaughtered by the same group of people. Everybody has their own opinion.

But let us not distort the facts here. The facts are that we have credible evidence from a cable sent to the United States State Department which clearly indicates her support of certain types of drug control programs. That is reality, and that is a fact.

The other fact that I think we ought to emphasize here is that the money would not go through the Burmese Government. And nobody—I mean nobody that I know of—would support funding through that government.

I would also suggest that perhaps the Senator from Vermont—Vermont is a little bit different from what it is in Arizona. Perhaps in Vermont he does not have kids overdosing on drugs in the streets of the capital of his State. Mr. President, I do. The Senator from Vermont said it will not do much good. Maybe it will not do much good. But I know that people are dying in my home State from overdoses of heroin, from lethal doses of heroin that come directly from Burma, because it is a proven fact that 60 percent of the heroin that comes into the United States comes from Burma.

So, in all due respect to the Senator from Vermont and the people in his State, it is a compelling, urgent, and terrible problem that we have to take every possible step to cure. One of them would be to reduce the cultivation of this drug where it originates which does not require the participation of the Burmese Government.

Mr. President, it is a $2 million program we are talking about here. I am a bit curious why we should have to take up so much time of the Senate in a very large multibillion-dollar piece of legislation. But I would be willing to vote on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to table whenever he feels that we should.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, by way of very brief response to my friend from Arizona, the cable to which he referred was prepared a few days after Suu Kyi's release back in July. She subsequently learned that we provided information to SLORC on an alleged drug caravan which turned out to be used to attack ethnic groups on the border. Her views 2 days after being totally isolated for 6 years has since been fully informed by facts, which are that the money in all likelihood will end up with SLORC. She has since repeatedly opposed this cooperation, and in interviews, both with the press and with Congressmen who have been there, believe that it may threaten Burmese citizens.

Again, let me say reasonable people can differ about this. I totally respect my friend from Arizona and his interest in involvement in this issue. Fundamentally, it seems to me, the question is whether we should be cooperating with the SLORC, one of the worst regimes in the world, if not the worst.

I think we have probably debated this amendment fully. I am not aware of anybody else who wishes to speak.

Mr. President, I move to table the McCain amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote ''yea.''

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] is absent because of illness in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 560 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Faircloth	McConnell
Bennett	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Gregg	Moynihan
Brown	Harkin	Murkowski
Bryan	Heflin	Murray
Bumpers	Hollings	Pell
Burns	Inhofe	Pryor
Byrd	Inouye	Reid
Campbell	Jeffords	Robb
Chafee	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kennedy	Santorum
Coverdell	Kohl	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Shelby
Daschle	Leahy	Stevens
DeWine	Levin	Wellstone
Exon	Lott	

NAYS—47

Abraham	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Glenn	McCain
Baucus	Graham	Nickles
Bingaman	Gramm	Nunn
Bond	Grams	Pressler
Breaux	Grassley	Roth
Coats	Hatch	Simon
Cohen	Helms	Simpson
Conrad	Hutchison	Smith
Craig	Johnston	Snowe
Dodd	Kempthorne	Specter
Dole	Kerrey	Thomas
Domenici	Kerry	Thompson
Dorgan	Kyl	Thurmond
Feinstein	Lieberman	Warner
Ford	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Bradley	Hatfield

So, the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3042) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 3041

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Vermont to concur in the House amendment with an amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. President. Just so my colleagues understand, and I know there are a number of Senators on both sides who are going to want to speak, let me back up a bit.

First, the Senate has voted in favor of the conference report. The conference report reflected a conference that agreed on 192 out of 193 amendments. Now we have the 1 remaining amendment of those 193 which is in true disagreement, and we have received from the other body their proposal.

I have moved to amend their amendment in disagreement with an amendment by myself and the Senator from Kansas, Mrs. KASSEBAUM. What happened is the Senate conferees were not able to agree to a House provision that would reinstate the so-called Mexico City policy of the 1980's. As Senators may recall, the Mexico City policy caused much division in this country and picked up a lot of ridicule for this country abroad. It prohibits the U.S. Government from using its funds to support private family planning organizations that use their own funds to provide counseling and other services relating to abortion.

What my amendment does, it strikes the House provision and it replaces it with the identical Senate language that passed this body on September 21. Senator KASSEBAUM, who is the original author of this language, is a cosponsor of this amendment.

The amendment says that in determining eligibility for assistance, non-Government and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive to requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance; provided further that none of the funds made available under this act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

So no matter what your position is on abortion, U.S. money cannot be used to lobby for or against it. This has been very carefully thought out to give Senators who have strong views on the subject of abortion a common ground and be respectful of the views on both sides of this issue.

The sad thing about the House provision, which we are now seeking to amend and send back to the other body, is that it is not only totally and utterly unnecessary, but if it prevailed on this bill, it guarantees a veto, and the work of the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, and myself, as well as all the other Senators who joined with us in putting together the foreign aid bill, goes down the drain.

Our bill explicitly, and I wish Senators would listen to this, the Senate bill explicitly prohibits the use of any U.S. funds for abortion. Period. End of sentence. No qualifications.

It is the same prohibition that we have had for years. It is the same prohibition we had in the last Republican administration. It is the same prohibition we have in this administration. No funds in this bill can be used for abortion.

We are really ending up debating bumper-sticker slogans. We are ending up debating—I do not know—fundraising letters, whatever, but we are not debating the reality of the foreign aid bill.

The amendment I offered simply continues current law and practice, and at a time when support for voluntary family planning programs and women's reproductive health is growing around the world, it would be ridiculous for the United States to, once again, surrender its leadership in this area as we did back in the eighties.

Some have defended the House provision, because it only prohibits U.S. support for foreign organizations. That is precisely the problem. It is by supporting foreign organizations that we implement our family planning programs. We do not stop the population explosion in other parts of the country by saying we will send the money to Planned Parenthood of Winooski, VT. We do it by sending the money where family planning might help. In fact, let me give just one example of what the House provision would do.

A current program that uses United States funds to train Russian doctors in providing family planning services would have to shut down because it takes place in a Russian hospital. In that Russian hospital, Russian funds are used to perform legal abortions. In Russia, the average woman has seven abortions, something I find, and I hope most people would find, to be a terrible situation.

But in our program, which tries to help the Russian doctors teach family planning so they will not be having seven abortions, the House provision says you cannot do that. You cannot do that because in the place where they would teach that, somewhere else in that same building abortions might take place.

Well, come on, this is Alice in Wonderland. You teach alternatives to abortion at a place where people who are interested in that subject might be.

The whole point of this program is to promote contraceptives and alternatives to abortion. It does not ask for money for abortion, it seeks alternatives. Every dollar is for voluntary—voluntary—family planning. I say to my colleagues, if you vote against the amendment of the Senator from Kansas and myself, let there be no mistake, that opposes voluntary family planning if you vote against it.

The other point I want to emphasize is no funds in this bill can be used in China. I heard the debate earlier about people who are concerned about what happens in China. Well, I am concerned. I am appalled by forced sterilization. I am appalled by forced abortions. I am appalled by the Chinese

Government telling people, under pain of all kinds of strictures, how many children they can have. We all are, but do not knock down our ability to help the voluntary family planning in other countries by holding up as a straw man somehow the situation in China.

Chinese population policy should be condemned, but do not condemn the program. In fact, the House provision would prevent the United States from contributing to the U.N. population fund. It is the largest international family planning agency in the world. UNFPA does not fund abortion. It has an explicit policy against supporting abortion. It funds contraceptives, education and informs about family planning in 140 countries. It is absolutely vital the United States play a leading role in the U.N. agency at a time when the decisions we make today will determine if the world population doubles or even triples. The Chinese population policy should be condemned, but do not condemn an organization that seeks to demonstrate to the Chinese Government that they can achieve the same results with voluntary family planning.

As I said, we contain a prohibition against using U.S. funds in China. That is despite the fact U.N. programs in China promote voluntary family planning and human rights.

Mr. President, let us not go backwards, not when so many governments are finally seeking out and limiting rates of population growth. Many of these countries are already impoverished. We have the technology, the expertise and the interest in helping. The amendment in the House requires UNFPA to withdraw from China. That is a decision not for UNFPA but its governing board, which is made up of its donor governments. By attaching a condition UNFPA cannot meet, we cut off funding for programs in 139 other countries.

So just understand what is here. In the amendment of the Senator from Kansas and myself, no money for abortion, no money for child care, but money for voluntary family planning. If you are against voluntarily family planning, vote against it. But if you would like to see, as we do, the ability to give some of these countries alternatives to abortion, then vote with us. And also, with all the work that has gone into this bill, let us complete the bill so it can actually be signed into law by the President and not vetoed.

I see the cosponsor, my good friend from Kansas, on the floor. I yield to her.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HATFIELD be made a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the language that I am cosponsoring with my colleague from Vermont is, as he has said, identical language that was included in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill, which passed the Senate in September by a vote of 91–9.

It is also language similar to that which passed the Senate in 1984 and in 1989. At this time, as Senator LEAHY pointed out, House and Senate conferees were able to reconcile every other aspect of the legislation, except this issue. The House insisted upon their language, we insisted upon ours and, thus, the bill was reported out of conference with this language in disagreement. I think that if the House passed the language they passed and if we pass the language offered in this amendment, it is my understanding that a continuing resolution would continue for the bill with everything passed—the language of everything passed in a continuing resolution, except current language reporting the issue at stake in disagreement here.

The language that has been introduced does not change the current U.S. policy that prohibits funding for abortion activities. It simply ensures that foreign governments and nongovernmental organizations will be treated in the same way with respect to establishing eligibility for U.S. population assistance. If abortion is legal in a country and if a foreign government is engaged in population assistance programs, why should we tell a nongovernmental agency or organization working in that country that they cannot use U.S. funds? It seems to me they should be able to use them for population assistance, Mr. President. That is what this issue is about. It is not about abortion.

As I think all colleagues know, this issue first came about in 1984 at the International Conference on Population in Mexico City. The Reagan administration announced that any nongovernmental organization which used private or non-U.S. funds to contract abortion-related activities would be prohibited from receiving U.S. population assistance. If they use their own private, or if their own non-U.S. funds in any way are involved, as the Senator from Vermont pointed out, then they could not receive any U.S. funds for population assistance.

I just feel that it is far too limiting, Mr. President. It really cripples us in our ability to help other nations deal with population assistance initiatives.

Since 1973, the United States has prohibited the use of U.S. dollars by any recipient of U.S. population assistance to pay for abortions abroad. I support this.

However, Mr. President, this amendment, as I said before, is not about an abortion. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, it would prohibit funds going to China. It would also prohibit funds which could be used for lobbying for or against abortion. So I think it is important to keep in mind exactly what it is about. It is about supporting nongovernmental organizations in creating safe, effective, comprehensive family planning programs—programs that are designed to prevent the need for abortion.

Mr. President, some of my colleagues have argued that the United States should not have a role in international population assistance programs. But while some contend that there is no relationship between world population and our national security, a closer look, I think, at all the factors involved make it clear that population stabilization is in our best interest. Without such an effort, the world's political, economic, and environmental forces balance precariously on the verge of chaos.

I think I came to realize this most clearly as I have spent a number of years on the Africa Subcommittee in the Foreign Relations Committee. It has shown me that arguments to the contrary are misinformed. The population assistance initiatives are important. There is no doubt in my mind, for example, that overpopulation played a major role in compounding famine in Africa. I do not think I need to point out to anyone here the tragedies that have resulted from that, or could result from that, and the importance of doing thoughtful, constructive population assistance initiatives. It is not easy. We have to be very sensitive to cultural differences as we work in other countries and support work in other countries. But, clearly, it seems to me that it does have merit and it is important.

I realize that many of my colleagues here are tired of this fight. But I continue to believe strongly in preventing the need for abortion by working to establish effective family planning programs. I hope my colleagues will similarly recognize the need to prevent what has been called the international gag rule from ever emerging as an obstacle to creating effective policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. I suggest, Mr. President, it is not really an issue of the President vetoing this bill. In my mind, it is an issue of the merit or demerit of this amendment. I feel strongly that this amendment really says that we do care about working together with nongovernmental organizations, with other countries, being sensitive and constructive with family planning initiatives.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kansas have done more in the last few minutes to clarify this issue than I think has been done for some time—the very clear point that the Senate position on this in the past does not provide Federal funding for abortions through these organizations. That is the fact. For that reason, I stand in strong opposition, as well, to the House language.

The House language endangers our national interests. It is not simply an

antichoice or antiabortion, or a proabortion issue, as some of the proponents say. What it is is antifamily planning. The House position smacks of being against the interests of women and international development.

Population assistance is a critical component of our foreign aid program, and a worthy investment in bracing for the threats to U.S. national security that will arise throughout the 21st century.

Even President Nixon, who was not known as a prochoice activist, listed population growth ''among the most important issues we face * * * a world problem which no country can ignore, whether it is moved by the narrowest perception of national self-interest or the widest vision of common humanity.''

Indeed, President Nixon pledged full U.S. support and cooperation in supporting U.N. population and family planning programs at the same time the United States played an active role in founding the U.N. population fund known as the UNFPA.

If we were to enact the House language, Mr. President, we would cut off support for UNFPA as well as the crucial private organizations supporting family planning and women's rights and manageable population growth.

Mr. President, the world population today stands at 5.7 billion people, almost double what it was in 1960. It is growing by about 100 million people per year. Most of this growth is in the developing world in regions that cannot, of course, sustain their current populations.

The environmental and economic effects of this population program are very significant. The effect on women as a population is really disastrous. If development efforts are going to be successful, they have to include the full participation of women—at least 50 percent of the world population.

However, if women are not given control of their own bodies, or if they are compelled to carry and deliver unlimited numbers of children, then they cannot be full partners. They cannot be full partners politically, economically, or socially in the development of their country.

The U.S. population programs, in conjunction with international strategies, have actually yielded incredible results for our country and for the world. We have seen reductions in maternal mortality rates. We have seen improved child survival statistics. We have seen increased literacy among women. And we have seen healthier, burgeoning economies in many parts of the world.

Mr. President, this in turn strengthens U.S. efforts to promote food security, international trade, and improved public health, all of which improve our standard of living. And they also reduce the risk of disaster assistance or the deployment of U.S. troops, as the Senator from Kansas was alluding to in her previous remarks.

I have had the opportunity to work with the Senator on the Foreign Affairs Committee on the subcommittee concerning Africa where these problems can become very, very severe very quickly.

The provision of population assistance and family planning services is important to the United States. Mr. President, again, it is hardly support for abortion—although the House amendment infers this.

In fact, Mr. President, that is what I think is the fundamental misunderstanding in this debate, and I think we need to dispel that today. Abortion does not equal family planning; in fact, responsible and safe family planning reduces the need for and incidence of abortion. Nevertheless, somehow this debate always winds up being a bit of a red herring debate about abortion.

Mr. President, if the proponents of the House amendment were trying to prohibit U.S. funds from being used to pay for abortion, they already achieved that goal many years ago. U.S. foreign assistance cannot by law be used to pay for abortion. Let me repeat that: U.S. foreign assistance cannot by law—by current law—be used to pay for abortion. It says so throughout the foreign aid law, and it is reiterated in this conference report that we are considering right now.

Now, Mr. President, barring people from speaking about family planning, contraceptives, and abortion will not solve the problem, not to mention the fact that it is a blow for the concept of free speech that the United States worked so hard to promote throughout the world.

Similarly, cutting off private groups which use funds from other sources for their abortion activities is only going to hurt the pursuit of U.S. Government interests. As in the 1980's when we saw some of these regressive policies applied, most effective organizations turned down U.S. funding since they could not and would not agree to these conditions.

I commend them for their perseverance, but I think it was shameful that the United States did not contribute to programs designed to meet our own needs. These are the reasons that the House language on Mexico City policy and the gag rule have to be stripped from this conference report and why the Kassebaum language should be restored.

As for these counterproductive restrictions on UNFPA, I again submit, as I and others did before the Foreign Affairs Committee, that this is an attack on family planning. It is not a serious attempt to stop abortion, nor is it a serious attempt to do anything about the disgusting practice of coercive abortion.

Pulling out of the U.N. population fund is not going to stop coercive abortion in China, for the simple fact that UNFPA does not engage if any coercive abortion procedures in China now. UNFPA's mandate in every country, including China, is the provision of family planning services and maternal and child health care in 140 countries around the world. It has no mandate—it has no mandate—to engage in the provision of abortion or abortion-related services.

Mr. President, in reality, it is programs supported by the UNFPA that make abortion less likely. If I believe that withdrawing from the UNFPA would reduce the incidence of coercive abortion in China, I would wholeheartedly support such a move.

Human rights abuses such as this should be addressed at the United Nations and through diplomatic and economic levers such as the most-favored-nation status approach, which I have advocated and continue to advocate with regard to China.

In fact, this is one of the reasons why I introduced legislation this year with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS, to withdraw MFN from China.

Mr. President, prohibiting United States contributions unless the UNFPA pulls out of China is going to do nothing to solve this problem. UNFPA officials have already expressed their firm opposition to the practice of coercive abortion despite what some Members on this floor have said in what amounts to misquoting the organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, a letter I received from the UNFPA on their perceptions on the China policy, which I hope will clear up the misunderstanding.

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

UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND,
New York, NY, July 26, 1995.

Senator RUSSELL FEINGOLD,
Senate Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINGOLD: It has just come to my attention that on June 28, 1995 during a debate on the House floor, Representative Chris Smith quoted Dr. Sadik, Executive Director of UNFPA, ''China has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy and control of its population growth over the past 10 years. Now the country could offer its experiences and special experts to help other countries.'' Senator Jesse Helms used the same quote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report accompanying S–961.

I believe this quote comes from China Daily, an English language newspaper published in Beijing. I was with Dr. Sadik when she was interviewed for this article in 1991. This article was a terrible distortion of what she actually said. Dr. Sadik did say that China should be proud of its record of improving women's and children's health since 1949. She commended China's continuing efforts to improve maternal and child health by discussing a joint UNFPA and UNICEF project in 300 poor counties in China that especially focuses on improving children's health through training and supplies for treatment of acute respiratory infection and diarrhea, promotion of prenatal care and nutrition, breast-feeding, assisted deliveries and family planning that assured several contraceptive choices and informed consent.

She went on to say that this project was a model that could be replicated in other countries.

I have no idea why Dr. Sadik was misquoted. I tried unsuccessfully at the time to secure a retraction from China Daily. I remember during her visit being very proud of Dr. Sadik's tenacity and courage and my disappointment with the China Daily article which was not only wrong, but contradictory of her real position.

In fact, during this trip, Dr. Sadik attended a series of meetings that included: the Ministers of Family Planning and Health, the Head of the People's Congress and several of his colleagues and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of China. During these meetings she was very critical of new laws in several provinces requiring sterilization of the mentally retarded. She also successfully negotiated projects designed to increase training for informed consent and voluntary participation in family planning, and research that would examine the safety and efficacy of the Chinese steel ring IUD. The first project, currently ongoing, provides interpersonal counseling training and promotes contraceptive choices for grass-roots family planning workers in several provinces. The second resulted in a Chinese ban on steel ring IUD's in favor of copper based IUD's which in ten years will prevent 35.6 million abortions. It would also prevent 6,300 maternal deaths; 365,000 potential infant and 28,000 potential child deaths.

For 3-½ years I served as UNFPA's Country Director in China. I know first hand what we did and said in China and I can tell you that the way we are frequently portrayed, such as in the statement in question, is absolutely and unequivocally untrue.

UNFPA has always represented international norms and human rights standards as articulated in several U.N. documents including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the World Population Plan of Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development. For example, Chapter VII, para. 12 of the Programme of Action which states ". . . the principle of informed free choice is essential to the long-term success of family-planning programmes; that any form of coercion has no part of play; that governmental goals or family planning should be defined in terms of unmet needs for information and services; and that demographic goals, while legitimately the subject of government development strategies, should not be imposed on family-planning providers in the form of targets or quotes for the recruitment of clients".

In particular, Dr. Sadik has been a champion of human rights, women's equality and reproductive rights. In the 14 years I have known her, I have never heard her use the phrase "population control."

We deeply appreciate your past and continuing support and hope you can help set the record straight regarding the quote used by Representative Smith and Senator Helms.

Sincerely,

STIRLING D. SCRUGGS,
Chief, Information and External Relations Division.

Mr. FEINGOLD. United States funds are already adequately and elaborately protected from being used in China at all. In reality, what the House amendment is trying to do is prohibit U.S. support for family planning in the 140 other countries that the UNFPA operates. It essentially punishes the United States and other countries of the international community for China's human rights violations which the UNFPA, again, is simply not responsible for.

As we look to the 21st century, we should have a post-Mexico City policy on population. The House amendment brings us backward—not forward. Family planning is too important for us to lose ground on. But that is exactly what the House amendment does. It causes us to lose ground on population control.

We cannot let this stand, Mr. President. I urge my colleagues to support the Leahy amendment and to strip this extreme amendment from the bill. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me first say I intend to speak for just a moment on the budget and on the President's veto threat.

However, let me say about the pending amendment that the House of Representatives has taken a very clear position that maintains the position that Congress has historically taken—that is, there is a higher standard when you are spending the taxpayers' money.

In spending the taxpayers' money, the House has taken the position that we should not be spending the taxpayers' money either in the United States or around the world to fund abortion on demand, and we should not be spending the taxpayers' money to subsidize forced abortions in China.

I think we need to reject this amendment. I think we need to stay with the House position. I am confident that we will.

Mr. President, our leader, Senator DOLE, and the Speaker of the House, Congressman GINGRICH, are both down at the White House today meeting with the President about the growing confrontation concerning our budget.

I wanted to make some remarks about this confrontation because I think we are coming down to the moment of truth where each of us is going to have to decide what the 1994 elections were about, what we stand for, what we are willing to stand up and fight for, and what we are willing to compromise on.

I want to make just a few observations this afternoon on those subjects.

First of all, we have adopted in both the House and the Senate a budget that does what we promised to do in the election. It balances the budget over a 7-year period. It saves Medicare. It reforms welfare. It changes the relationship between the Government and the people.

In a very modest way, it begins to let working families keep more of what they earn to invest in their own children, their own families, and their own futures.

The President has said so many times that he is going to veto our budget bill, that I think people are beginning to believe him—not that repetition is always a guarantee. But I think we have to start thinking seriously about the possibility that the President might veto the budget bill that we have passed.

I think it is important for individual Members of the Senate to start making it clear where they stand on this issue. That is what I want to do this afternoon.

First of all, the President is asking us, by vetoing our budget, to continue to spend money we do not have on programs we cannot afford.

The President has sent not one but two budgets to Congress, and both of those budgets would increase the public debt by over $1 trillion in 5 years. Neither of those budgets would ever come into balance at any finite time in the future. Both of those budgets would give us a deficit that greatly exceeds $200 billion in the year that our budget would be in balance.

Now, the President says he is going to veto our budget to force us to spend more money. Let me make it clear that no matter what might be agreed to, I am not going to vote to bust the budget that we wrote here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Under no circumstances am I going to vote to increase spending above the level we set out in our budget.

The President has every right, if he wants to enter legitimately into the debate by submitting a real budget that is balanced over a 7-year period, to negotiate with us about spending priorities. It is obvious his priorities are different, but I think those differences are legitimate, and I think they ought to be debated. But, unless the President is going to submit a budget to us which tell us how he would balance the Federal budget, I am not willing to allow him to force us to back away from our budget.

Our proposal to the President, as a precondition for our negotiation with him, ought to include the following items:

No. 1. Tell us how you would balance the budget over a 7-year period, not by wishing the problem away, but in terms that we can all understand and in terms that the Congressional Budget Office, which is the accountant for this process as designated by the President, can certify will really achieve a balanced budget. From that point we can then begin to compare the two budgets.

Second, it seems to me if the President is really committed to balancing the budget, he ought to endorse the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which has passed the House and which is only one vote short of the two-thirds vote needed to pass the Senate and send to the States. I want to call on the President, if he is serious about balancing the budget, to come out and endorse the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, to help us get one additional Democrat to vote for it, and in the process allow us to send it to the States.

I believe it is high time that we let working people keep more of what they earn. In 1950, the average family with two children sent $1 out of every $50 to Washington. Today, that family is

sending $1 out of every $4 to Washington. I think our action of giving a $500 tax credit per child for every working family in America so they can spend their own money on their own children and on their own futures, is long overdue. There is no circumstance under which I am going to back away from our tax cut so that Bill Clinton can spend more money in Washington, DC.

This is not a debate about how much money we spend on children, but it is certainly a debate about who is going to do the spending. President Clinton and the Democrats want the Government to do the spending. We want the family to do the spending. We know the Government. We know the family. And we know the difference.

So, I think, to conclude and let the debate go back to the amendment before the Senate, for 40 years we have been running up bills in Washington, DC. For 40 years we have been borrowing more and more money. The President's argument to us is, ''We have run up these bills. Raise the debt ceiling and pay the bills.''

It reminds me of an argument that was made when I was a young Member of Congress, in my first year, the first debate I ever participated in. Then-majority leader of the House Jim Wright got up when we were getting ready to vote on the debt ceiling, and he said, ''It is as if your spouse has run up a big bill on the credit card and the bill collector is knocking at the door. You have to pay your bills.''

That is what the President is in essence saying to us.

My response is, let us look at what American families do under these circumstances. They do pay their bills. But they do something we have not done in 40 years. They sit down around the kitchen table, they get out a pad and pencil, they write down how much money they earn, they start adding up their expenses, they put together a budget, they get out their credit cards, they get out the butcher knife, they cut up their credit cards, and they resolve that, while they are going to pay their bills today, they are not going to put themselves in a position where every year the bill collector is pounding on the door.

I believe defaulting on the public debt would be irresponsible. I believe shutting the Government down to make a political point is unnecessary and unfair. But there is something worse than defaulting on the debt. There is something worse than shutting the Government down. And that is continuing a spending spree that will destroy the future of our children. That is worse than both shutting the Government down and defaulting on the debt. And I am not going to vote for a budget, and I am not going to vote for a compromise, that continues the spending spree in Washington, DC.

The American people in 1994 gave us a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress with a clear mandate: Stop the taxing, stop the spending, and stop the regulating. I, for one, am not willing to cut a deal in Washington, DC, with President Clinton, to undercut an election that sought to fundamentally change the way Government is run in Washington, DC.

So I think we ought to negotiate with the President. I think we ought to try to work with the President. But we ought to make it very clear to the President that we are not going to back away from our commitment to balance the budget. We are not going to spend money we do not have on programs we cannot afford. And there is no amount of threat and bluster that can be exercised by the President that is going to induce us to pull down our budget and continue the spending spree in Washington, DC.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to support the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment on family planning.

The House has taken an extreme position on international family planning. If their position prevails, the world's poorest women will pay the price. I urge my colleagues to stick with the Senate position. The Senate bill prohibits funds from being used to perform abortions—or to do anything in China. But it does this while continuing to provide family planning services and maternal and children's health care to the poorest people in the world.

The House position is extreme because it would gut our international family planning programs. It would prohibit organizations that use their own funds for abortion services from receiving any U.S. funds. It would prohibit these organizations from offering any information on abortion—even factual information about mortality related to unsafe abortion. The House amendment would also limit U.S. participation in UNFPA—which has the infrastructure, the expertise, and the personnel to be the most effective program for providing family planning services around the world.

The effects of this House position on women's health would be disastrous. Over 100 million women throughout the world cannot obtain or are not using family planning because they are poor, uneducated, or lack access to care. Twenty million of these women will seek unsafe abortions. Some women will die, some will be disabled. Many of these women are very young; they are, in fact, still children themselves. When children have children, they often lose their chance to obtain schooling, a good job, and ultimately, self-sufficiency. If the House position prevails, women will not be able to fully participate in development and democratization.

In this bill, we seek to maintain our modest role in providing family planning to the world's poorest women. To this end, we should be clear about what is in the bill—and what is not.

This bill does not contain money for abortions or abortion lobbying. Federal funds cannot be used to fund abortions and this bill retains this prohibition. In fact, opponents of this amendment include Senators who strongly oppose abortion. They know that effective family planning actually reduces the number of abortions performed. And this bill does not contain money for China. No United States funds may currently be spent in China and the bill retains this policy as well.

This bill maintains current law. It continues to provide modest funding for the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA]. Without this assistance, the influence of the United States in the UNFPA is cut off. We would have no say on how and where international family planning services are delivered.

This bill continues to provide funds to the most efficient and effective private and nongovernmental organization. It is these organizations who know best how to make a little funding go a long way.

Mr. President, I wish we could do more to ensure that all women have access to family planning. The Leahy-Kassebaum amendment—which reaffirms the bill passed by the Senate—ensures that we continue to do something to help the world's poorest women to control and improve their lives. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have debated the issue of restrictions on international family planning many times in this body, and I regret that at this stage in the process, this issue threatens to bring down an important foreign aid bill.

This body voted by a significant margin just 1 month ago to preserve a reasoned family planning policy—one that supports important family planning work in the most needy areas around the globe. Population growth is a crisis that cannot be ignored, that will not wait for attention at a later date. Unchecked population growth will ultimately threaten every corner of the globe. And a withdrawal on our part from our current active role in education and technical assistance to successful family planning programs worldwide would be devastating.

Experience has proven that it does not take a lot of money to have a large effect upon population growth. However, it does take efficient programming, consistency, and a commitment for the long term. We put that all at risk in this debate today if we back away from the longstanding position of this body, that restrictions on family planning funding to nongovernmental organizations overseas should be the same as those applied to U.S. organizations.

Mr. President, the stakes in this debate are even higher today than usual. This is the only issue in disagreement between the two bodies on a large and substantive bill; 192 differences have been resolved, resulting in a reasonable bill that, with the exception of this

issue alone, has broad support on both sides of the aisle in both bodies and is acceptable to the administration. Yet, failure to insist on the Senate position on this important issue, namely a continuation of current law, would doom this important legislation to a certain veto. We have enough issues in disagreement with the administration without adding this one to the list.

I thank the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] for her consistent leadership on this issue and I urge support for the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment.

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, once again the Senate and the House face the prospect of holding up an important appropriations bill over the issue of abortion. I am dismayed that we find ourselves in this position especially because the bill before the Senate clearly and explicitly prohibits the use of U.S. funds to pay or lobby for abortion in our foreign aid programs. The programs at stake involve family planning—not abortion.

I am strongly pro-life and do not support abortion except in cases where the life of the mother is endangered. I am also strongly pro-family planning and have long been an outspoken supporter of our domestic and international family planning efforts. I support family planning because I believe if more couples have access to contraceptives and understand the consequences of the lack of family planning, we can make abortion a moot issue.

But beyond making abortion a moot issue, there are also development and environmental consequences of uncontrolled population growth. According to the United Nations, the 1990's will see the greatest increase in human numbers of any decade, as the world's population grows from 5.3 billion to 6.25 billion by the end of this century. We know that rapid population growth in the developing world can overwhelm the gains made in living standards.

According to the World Bank, in sub-Saharan Africa the 3.7-percent growth in gross domestic product will not be sufficient to offset the effects of skyrocketing population growth, and the number of poor will increase. On the environment front, when we look at ozone depletion, global warming, destruction of tropical rain forests, and the elimination of species diversity, we inevitably see the connection between those phenomena and the population explosion.

The international family planning programs that we fund through the U.S. Agency for International Development and the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] ensure that the United States will maintain a leadership role in addressing the population problem. The House limitations which were struck by the Senate would undermine our ability to continue to play this important role.

I would like to mention in particular our support of the UNFPA. The House amendment would prohibit the United States from participating in the UNFPA unless the President certifies that the UNFPA will withdraw its program from China. No one condones China's coercive abortion policy—I certainly do not. In fact, there are specific prohibitions already in law on the use of United States funds for UNFPA's program in China. And although there have been allegations that UNFPA funds were going to support coercive abortions in China, these allegations have never been substantiated. The problem is with China's family planning program, not the UNFPA's.

Despite the fact that the United States has been quite outspoken against the practices in China and has already prohibited the use of our funds there, those opposed to family planning continue to use it as a reason to withdraw all of our support for the UNFPA. This would mean that the U.S. could not participate in a program that has the ability to reach into areas where no single U.S. program can. The UNFPA currently provides voluntary family planning assistance to over 140 countries besides China; 90 of those nations have populations expected to double within the next 30 years. In addition, nearly half of UNFPA's assistance is used for family planning services and maternal and child health care in the poorest, most remote regions in the world. As a nation, we cannot afford to limit our participation in the UNFPA.

Therefore, I am pleased to say that I am a cosponsor of the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment to strike the House amendment and return to current law on lobbying for or against abortion which was so carefully crafted by our colleague from Kansas. I hope that the Senate will retain the position we had when we first passed this bill. Moreover, I hope those on both sides of the issue will take a closer look at what we are doing by polarizing the issue of abortion and using it to hold up these very important funding bills. Can we not come together to try to resolve the abortion question through the authorizing process? If not, I am afraid we are relegating ourselves to years of deadlock and further polarization.●

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1996 offered by my good friend from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, and my good friend from Vermont, Senator LEAHY.

Mr. President, international population growth is a significant issue for foreign policy for the United States. It is a significant issue for domestic policy, for that matter. Of all the challenges facing our Nation and the world, none compares to that of increasing population growth.

Our efforts to protect the environment, to promote economic development around the world, and to raise the status of women, will be futile if we do not first address the staggering rate of global population growth.

How can we expect underdeveloped countries to pull themselves up when the world's population is growing at a rate of more than 10,000 people per hour? Today, there are more than 5.7 billion people on this Earth.

We simply must address these issues. We must acknowledge that we cannot talk about population growth without talking about the very real and very tragic effects of overpopulation:

First, the destruction of our environment; and

Second, the destruction of people—mostly women and young children who live in poverty and die from malnutrition, starvation, lack of access to basic health care, and botched illegal abortions.

We need to be working to address these issues instead of spending countless hours debating our philosophical differences on abortion. We have been over that issue more times than any of us care to count.

Mr. President, I believe direct, substantial, and long-term benefits flow to American families from our national investment in sustainable development and population efforts.

Today, as we approach the 21st century, we are facing a world that will be more economically competitive and more challenging than ever before. This is not the time to be weakening our role as the world leader in these areas.

Instead, I believe it is in the best interest of America's children and families for the Congress to reaffirm and solidify our commitment to population stabilization, reproductive choice, and other critical health and sustainable development programs.

For the past 12 years or so, I have spent a lot of my time here in the Senate focussing on the domestic and international high-technology industries. I have worked to develop strategies to strengthen the technology and manufacturing bases in this country and to secure higher wage jobs for Americans.

I have focussed on these issues because of my concern for the long-term economic viability of our Nation. I believe that to secure our economic future, the United States must be fully equipped to compete long term with Japan and other highly developed countries.

But at the same time, I believe we cannot have a successful economic strategy in this country if we do not devote serious attention to the economies of the developing world.

Over the past 10 years or so, growth in U.S. exports to the developing world has exploded; and today, developing countries account for about 40 percent of a growing U.S. export market.

In fact, trade with the developing world is growing at a rate that far exceeds the growth rate of U.S. exports to developed countries.

I believe a significant factor in this growth has been the modest U.S. commitment to development and population assistance in the developing countries.

Mr. President, funding for efforts such as those of the U.N. Population Fund and the UNFPA, are critical to addressing these issues which are among the most serious the world faces and is why I rise in strong support of the Kassebaum-Leahy amendment to the foreign operations appropriations bill and hope that we will once again send a strong message to the House that this funding must, and will, be preserved.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment puts me in a difficult position because it combines two separate issues.

On one hand, I have consistently supported efforts to reverse the so-called Mexico City or International Gag Rule policy and therefore support reinserting the Kassebaum language that overturns the Mexico City policy.

On the other hand, I have consistently opposed United States funding for the U.N. Population Fund while the organization continues to operate in China. The amendment before us would strike a restriction on UNFPA funding that I have supported.

Of course, I must vote yes or no on the entire amendment. I cannot vote for part and against part.

Therefore, upon reflection, I will vote in favor of the amendment. International family planning programs provide important services that lead to healthier families and help to prevent high population growth rates, environmental degradation, and the need for abortion.

We can and we should continue to prohibit U.S. tax dollars from being used for abortions. But, I believe that the U.S. Government should not be dictating what nongovernmental organizations do with their own funds in their work to provide family planning services around the globe, as long as they do not use any Federal funds for abortion.

Nevertheless, I would like to make it clear to my colleagues and constituents that my vote today does not represent a change in my position on U.S. funding for the U.N. Population Fund at this time. We must continue to do all that we can to pressure the Government of China to cease any program of forced abortion or sterilization as a means of population control.

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment that has been offered by Senator LEAHY and Senator KASSEBAUM. I ask unanimous consent to be included as cosponsor of that amendment.

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, first of all I would like to correct a few of the statements that were made by the previous speaker, the Senator from Texas. He said that this position that is embraced in the amendment of Senator LEAHY and Senator KASSEBAUM has been rejected by the Congress in the past. That is not true. Back in 1989 both the House and the Senate, in fact, rejected the Mexico City policy.

In addition, he said this amendment before us today embraces coercive abortion. Nothing could be further from the truth. No one here supports coercive abortions. It is morally wrong, and, furthermore, it is illegal.

The fact is, our policy does not support abortions in terms of international family planning assistance. Unfortunately, this issue has been misrepresented so many times in the past. We have to get beyond those misrepresentations with respect to this issue.

The United States does not support, through its international family planning assistance, abortion. Those funds cannot even be commingled with an organization that may use its funds for abortion. The fact of the matter is, under the Mexico City policy, our funds could still go to a government that uses its own funds for abortion or abortion-related activities. Yet, on the other hand, we deny those organizations who are the most instrumental and the most effective in providing international family planning assistance, family planning money, if in fact they use their own private funds for abortion-related activities.

This amendment would overturn the Mexico City policy. That is what the Senate voted on, and, I might add, by a vote of 57 to 43—57 to 43.

Unfortunately, the House has chosen not to compromise at all on this issue. But I would urge the Senate to stay firm and committed to the position that we have taken—that not only do we reject the Mexico City policy, but that, yes, we continue to provide funds to UNFPA which we are also on record in support of.

I think it is unfortunate that we have so many different issues entangled. The issue is whether or not you support family planning. If you are against abortion, the most reasonable approach to take is to support international family planning programs. The United States has been the forerunner. We were a leader in international family planning assistance. We cofounded UNFPA. We sit on their governing board. Now we are saying, well, we are sorry. We will somehow untangle all of this family planning money under the notion of abortion when, in fact, our money does not go for that purpose. If we are truly serious about supporting family planning programs that are effective, then we have to provide the necessary funding. That is what this is all about. We are asking that we put into permanent law a nondiscriminatory policy on the funding of private organizations, that we treat them the same as we do foreign governments. It is a matter of simple fairness, and it should be preserved.

What we are talking about here today are the programs that are so essential that will make a difference in the developing countries. These include voluntary family planning services, contraceptive research, maternal health programs, and child survival programs.

That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about abortion. The fact is that this Congress back in 1973 passed the Helms amendment that prohibits the use of any U.S. funds for abortion-related activities. That is the law. That will continue to be the law. What we are supporting is assistance through international family planning programs, and to those private organizations that have been the most effective around the world.

So it is a matter of whether or not we want to assist those countries that have a truly difficult problem in controlling population growth, if we deny assistance as American assistance to these programs, such as the International Planned Parenthood Program that provides more than assistance to more than 160 countries. When the Mexico City policy that took effect that Senator KASSEBAUM referred to back in 1984, 50 of those affiliates around the world were denied assistance. This has impaired our ability to support the most capable family planning programs in countries such India, which has more births each year than do Nigeria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Brazil, and Mexico combined.

I think it is a sad irony that by the time the Mexico City Conference 10 years ago embraced this policy that denial of additional American assistance to family planning programs came at a time when most developing countries had come to understand the importance of voluntary family planning programs to their own countries' development. It is interesting because it took that long for us to convince other countries what they needed to do, and the validity of those programs and the impact it would have in containing the growth in those countries. Now we are attempting to resume our leadership role, and some are asking us to turn our backs.

If we believe in voluntarism and family planning—and we do—and, if we believe that abortion should be avoided as a method of family planning—and we do—then we should maintain our leadership. We have unrivaled influence in setting standards for family planning programs. A great number of other donors and recipient countries adopted our own model in their own program.

And I would hope that we would reject the arguments in that tradition in the position taken by the House of Representatives with respect to this issue because it is taking us a step backward. We talk about UNFPA being a leader, an organization that has been

a leader in international family planning programs, and, in fact, provides a third of all of the assistance in delivering family planning programs around the world.

UNFPA does not support coercive abortions in China. No one does. We put a number of restrictions on our assistance to UNFPA because they still work in China. They are trying to prevent what is happening in China. But we put restrictions in any event so those who say our money is fungible can be transferred to one account to another. The United States did not contribute to UNFPA during the time of the Mexico City policy. We also denied assistance to UNFPA, but in 1993 the U.S. resumed contributions to the UNFPA organizations with four major limitations. One, that no United States funds could go to China; two, United States funds are prohibited from funding coercive abortions and involuntary sterilization; that United States funds to UNFPA must be held in a separate account from all other UNFPA funds so there is no comingling; and, that UNFPA funding for China could not increase for the 5 years once the United States resumes its contributions to UNFPA. In fact, the UNFPA program in China will end at the end of this year.

So we have enormous protection in the event that any money would be transferred indirectly—not indirectly because we have never provided funds in that regard—but even indirectly because of UNFPA's presence in China. So we have put all those protections into law.

But now people are saying we should not provide any assistance to UNFPA. That is the leading organization providing and supporting multilateral family planning programs throughout the developing world. I think that is a truly regrettable. We should be doing everything that we can to assist these countries in controlling their population problems because we know the implications that it has for global and economic instability.

So I think that we as a country should be a leader in that regard as we have been in the past. I hope we will resume that leadership role.

Mr. President, I urge Members of the Senate to adopt the amendment offered by Senator LEAHY and Senator KASSEBAUM. I think that there is no question that these countries need our assistance. They need our help. They need our leadership in international family planning—not only in our country and our own future, but for theirs as well.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment on funding for international family planning programs and against the House position to cut and restrict family planning aid.

I want to commend my colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE, for the excellent statement which she just made on the subject.

The House position, which we should all vote to reject, is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It pretends to be anti-abortion. But in fact, it is anti-family planning and does not affect the question of abortion funding at all.

In addition, the House position pretends to address the horrendous problem of forced abortions in the People's Republic of China—in the guise of trying to solve that terrible problem by denying United States support for the United Nations Population Fund.

Mr. President, the debate surrounding UNFPA began over a decade ago during the Reagan administration. Foes of UNFPA claimed then, as they do today, that the United States should withdraw support for UNFPA because of the fund's presence in China, where there have been persistent reports of government sanctioned forced abortions.

Mr. President, there is no question that the Chinese do many things that I abhor. Forcing women to have abortions or forcing individuals to undergo sterilization is a gross violation of human rights and should be condemned by our Government at the highest level.

Likewise, the killing of female infants in China is widespread and repugnant—and appears to often go unpunished by Chinese officials.

But it would be illogical—and counterproductive—for the United States to pull out of those international agencies that give aid to children in China because the horrific practice of female infanticide plagues that nation.

So why should we ask UNFPA to carry the sins of China on its shoulders when it comes to the question of family planning?

The facts have never supported this approach.

When the question of UNFPA funding was first debated during the Reagan administration, officials under President Reagan investigated the issue and found—and I quote from an AID document from that time—that ''UNFPA is a benevolent factor in China which works to decrease the incidence of coercive abortion'' in China by providing effective family planning services. That same Reagan administration investigation found absolutely ''no evidence'' that UNFPA participated in or supported in any way China's coercive family planning practices.

Sadly, caught up in the pro-life politics of the time, UNFPA was nonetheless defunded by President Reagan. President Clinton has since resumed U.S. support for this agency, and therein lie the roots of today's debate.

Through all of this, however, the facts have been clear—that UNFPA has been part of the solution in China, by helping to reduce the incidence of abortion in that country and others by providing high quality voluntary family planning services.

UNFPA's goal is to eliminate the need for abortions. They do so by providing maternal and child health care and voluntary family planning services. These are the kinds of programs that are unquestionably the most effective means of preventing abortion. And the majority of UNFPA's assistance goes towards projects in these areas.

In addition to targeting UNFPA funding for elimination, the House position seeks to reinstate language similar to what used to be called the Mexico City policy.

The House-adopted language is broad and ambiguous. It will impose a gag rule on foreign nongovernmental family planning organizations—denying those organizations U.S. support if they provide certain services—not limited to abortion—with their non-U.S. funds.

For example, in Russia, where abortion is legal, the United States currently provides humanitarian aid to help local family planning clinics deliver better services to women. Years ago, the United States determined this to be a priority within our Russian aid program because of the tragically high abortion rate for Russian women who, lacking family planning services, often have as many as 10 or 12 abortions over their life time.

If, however, we adopt the House language, we may be prevented from helping Russian family planning clinics simply because those clinics are affiliated with Russian hospitals where abortions are performed.

This would be making a bad situation worse—pulling support from clinics that are doing their best with scarce resources to provide alternatives to abortion for so many desperate Russian women.

So the House language is double trouble—targeting UNFPA, the world's largest source of voluntary family planning services, as well as the hundreds of smaller local family planning providers around the developing world.

Ironically, by denying support for so many organizations that provide quality family planning services, the House language might well have the unintended effect of increasing the incidence of abortion in China and elsewhere.

As has been pointed out by others during this debate, the foreign operations conference report continues the longstanding policy of banning the use of U.S. funds for abortions overseas. That ban, commonly known as the Helms Amendment, has been a part of the permanent foreign aid statute since 1973 and remains unchanged in the committee's bill.

Further, the conference report prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion lobbying.

In addition, UNFPA's own position on abortion provides additional safeguards. UNFPA does not, and never has, supported abortions or abortion-related services in any country in which it operates.

According to the UNFPA's governing Council, it is ''the policy of the UNFPA . . . not to provide assistance for abortion, abortion services, or abortion-related equipment and supplies as a method of family planning.''

So the real question facing the Senate today is this: The conference report is already stringently anti-abortion. But if we adopt the House language, thereby disqualifying the most tried and true family planning organizations from receiving U.S. support, do we really want to make this bill anti-family planning as well?

Let me take a minute to review for my colleagues why U.S. support for voluntary family planning is so important.

While childbirth anywhere carries certain risks, in the developing world mothers face grave statistics. In Africa, for example, 1 out of every 21 women will die as a result of pregnancy or childbirth, making the African woman 200 times more likely to die as a result of bearing her children than a European woman.

The kinds of programs provided by UNFPA and other voluntary family planning organizations can prevent many of these maternal deaths.

So when we support family planning aid, we are supporting those women and families across the developing world who seek the means to space their births and avoid high-risk pregnancies.

Equally important, when we support family planning aid, we are increasing the chances that child survival rates will increase across the developing world.

We know that babies born in quick succession, to a mother whose body has not yet recovered from a previous birth, are the least likely to survive. Voluntary family planning programs seek to support child survival efforts, and help women understand the vital link between child survival and family planning.

So as I noted in my earlier remarks, the House language will do nothing to prevent abortions in China or elsewhere. But it will prevent vital health services from being delivered to women and children in the world's poorest nations.

I urge my colleagues to remember what is really at stake here. This is a public health issue, and an extremely serious one.

Family planning saves lives. Experts estimate that the lives of 5.6 million children and 200,000 women could be saved every year if all the women who wanted to limit their families had access to family planning.

I ask my colleagues to really think about those statistics—5.6 million children and 200,000 women each year.

So when we debate this issue of whether to support voluntary family planning programs like UNFPA and others, let us keep this debate focused squarely where it belongs—on the world's young women, who struggle against impossible odds to better their lives, and who desperately need reproductive health care services.

Let us keep this debate squarely focused on the young mothers around the world, who have small children or babies and need family planning assistance to ensure that they do not become pregnant again too quickly—endangering their own lives and that of their babies and young children.

Let us keep this debate squarely focused on the thousands of women in poor nations who, lacking access to reproductive health care, resort to self-induced abortions and, too often, tragically lose their lives. Experts estimate that at least half a million women will die from pregnancy-related causes, roughly 200,000 from illegal abortions which are prevented when women have family planning services.

The issues of refunding UNFPA and the Mexico City policy came before Congress again and again when Presidents Bush and Reagan were in office. Congress repeatedly voted for the United States to resume UNFPA funding, and to reject Mexico City-like restrictions on our family planning program.

So let us move on to the task of ensuring that women in the developing world have access to the kinds of reproductive health services they deserve. Let us adopt the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment.

I yield back the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have spoken on this issue. And I also know that the Senate bipartisan leadership and the House bipartisan leadership are meeting with the President, so there will not be a roll-call vote immediately.

I urge Senators who wish to speak on this subject to come to the floor and speak. I see the distinguished Senator from California, and I ask the Senator if she wishes to speak.

Mrs. BOXER. About 7 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Whatever time the Senator wants.

Mr. President, I yield the floor so the distinguished Senator can, in her own right, have the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to rise in support of the Leahy amendment. I think the Senate was right on this issue, and I think the Senate should hold its ground. The Senator from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, worked hard to write language that makes sense. Senator LEAHY has worked with her.

We ought to be very clear in this body that we support family planning, certainly we do not want to see abortion, and we are not going to cut the legs out from under agencies that work to prevent abortion, that work to make sure there is family planning all over the globe.

These are nongovernmental entities that work hard to make sure that overpopulation is addressed by prevention. To punish—to punish—these nongovernmental entities in this bill, as the House wants to do, by restricting their funding and holding them to a standard that really has no rationale, to me, makes no sense. Then, of course, we have the attack on the U.N. Population Fund in this House amendment, which the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment would strike.

The United States was instrumental in creating the U.N. Population Fund in 1969 and, until 1985, provided nearly 30 percent of its funding. UNFPA is the largest internationally funded source of population assistance, directly managing one-third of the world's population assistance to developing countries. It is the principal multilateral organization providing worldwide family planning and population assistance to developing countries. It operates in over 140 countries in the poorest and the most remote regions of the world. Nearly half of the UNFPA assistance is used for family planning services and maternal and child health care. Another 18 percent is allocated for related population information, education, and communication.

I say to my friends who call themselves pro-life—and you have every right to call yourself whatever you want. And if that reflects your view on issues, fine. I feel I am for life, but I am pro-choice. And I feel I am for life because I am pro-choice, because I want to make sure that families have what they need to engage in sensible family planning so they are not faced with terrible choices.

Why on earth would the House of Representatives and some Members of the Senate want to punish an organization that helps people with family planning services, that educates them on how to prevent unwanted pregnancy, how to prevent sexually transmitted diseases such as AIDS and others? Why would we want to punish those organizations?

Well, I think it is clear why. Because when you strip it all away, there is punishment at work out here, punishment for organizations that believe it is very important to keep abortion safe and legal. And I do not think it is the job of the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives to lash out at these people who are working in the most difficult conditions, in the most difficult areas of the world, and punish them for no other reason other than they believe, if abortion is legal, let us make it safe. That is what this amendment would do.

The fund that the House of Representatives and the Republicans over there want to stop provides support for population data collection and analysis, demographic and socioeconomic research, and population policy formulation and evaluation.

What does that mean? It means that we need to know statistically what is

going on in these countries. Is birth control working? Is family planning working? How is the infant mortality rate connected with runaway population growth? In 1993, UNFPA supported 1,560 projects in 141 countries, including 44 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, 33 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, 39 countries in Asia and the Pacific, 25 countries in the Arab States, and in Europe.

Already we have a prohibition on U.S. dollars; they cannot be used for abortion. That is clear. And that has been in the law for a long time. But this is that long arm reach of big brother and the Contract With America that says, ''We are going to stop them from everything that they are doing, including family planning, even if they use their own funds for abortion-related activities.''

I find it incredible, my friends, that the Republican-led Congress that talks about States' rights and local control wants to take the long arm of Uncle Sam and put it in the middle of these countries, into nongovernmental organizations that are out in the worst circumstances, in the worst poverty, and stop these organizations from doing their good work by forcing them to say, ''You can never be involved, even with your own funds, in abortion-related activities, even if abortion is legal in the country.''

UNFPA programs contribute to improving the quality and safety of contraceptives, to reducing the incidence of abortion, and to improving reproductive health and strengthening the status of women. Well, I think we ought to be applauding the UNFPA. I think we ought to be applauding the work of the U.N. Population Fund, not saying, ''We're going to take away your funding, nongovernmental organizations in other countries, if you use your own funds to ensure that women get safe, legal abortions.''

You know, I was around this country when abortion was illegal, and I want to tell you what it was like because a lot of the younger people do not remember it, and some of the older, older people are beginning to forget.

But what it was like is the following: Abortions were illegal, but women still, in certain dire circumstances, chose to get them. They risked their lives. They had to go down back alleys. They had to beg, borrow, and steal the money. It was risky, and it was dangerous. Hundreds of women died every year. I do not understand how someone can call himself pro-life when they want to go back to those days.

Today we had a vote on the House side, an overwhelming vote, related to late-term abortions. To tell you how radical this group is over there, they did not even make an exception for the life of the mother.

So I say to the men in this country, think about what it would be like if your wife came home, they had found a cancer, she was in the mid-term of her pregnancy, and the doctor said, ''I cannot say that you will not die if you go ahead with this birth,'' and you and your wife and your family had to face a horrible decision, a terrible, terrible choice.

I ask you, why should Members of Congress climb into that living room with you and tell you what to do with your family? I am revolted by it. I am disgusted by it. And I am stunned that a party that says, ''We don't want to get in the middle of your life,'' would get right in the middle of your most personal decision.

What is going on here with the UNFPA is an outgrowth of that mentality. ''Oh, yeah, we want you to make your own decisions''—except if we disagree with it, then we are going to pass a law—''your most private, personal, difficult, agonizing choices that you should make as a family.'' And now we are going to reach in to nongovernmental organizations that operate in Latin America, in Africa, in Europe, and we are going to tell them as Members of Congress, because we are so important and we know so much about everything, that we are going to deny them funding even with their own funds, with their own privately raised funds—not our funds—they help a woman with a safe and legal abortion, rather than force her into some back alley and some butcher's knife.

I hope the Senate stands tall on this amendment. It is very important that we do. It is all interconnected. It is all about what we stand for as a nation. Do we stand for individual rights, or do we stand for Big Brother telling us how to make these private, agonizing, and difficult choices?

Let me tell you what the House did today in their vote. They said if there is a midterm or late abortion, it is illegal and the woman and the doctor can go to jail. Oh, yeah, they can defend themselves. The doctor can use as a defense, ''I thought her life would be threatened,'' but there is no presumption that the doctor can make that ruling, not even an exception for life of the mother.

In my opinion, what the House did today will lead to women dying if this Senate does not stand up against it. I have to tell you, I will stand on this floor as long as it takes—and people know me, they know I will—to stop that kind of legislation from becoming the law of the land, to stop an attack on women.

I have not read on this floor some of these cases and the agony of these cases where women are faced and their husbands are faced with the most difficult decisions of their lives. I, frankly, was not elected to be God, and I was not elected to be a doctor. They even made up a term called ''partial-birth abortions.'' There is no such scientific term. They made it up just to try to incite people's emotions.

Let me tell you, they are going too far. They are radical, and they are going too far. Just like they are radical in their budget when they take $270 billion out of Medicare and give a tax cut to the rich with it. Just like they are radical on their environmental policy where the Republican study group put out a bulletin—I am going to put it in the RECORD—that is a guide to Republicans in the House and says, ''Go home and plant a tree and visit your zoo and then they can never say you are against the environment.'' Go home and plant a tree and visit your zoo and give a report card out to the best environmentals and then, yes, you can vote against the Clean Air Act, the wetlands, forget the Endangered Species Act. Who needs the bald eagle anyway?

Well, it is a radical crowd. They have gone too far, and this is an example, UNFPA, an organization that does so much good out there.

UNFPA helps to promote male participation and responsibility in family planning programs; address adolescent reproductive health; reach isolated rural areas with high demands for family planning services.

They want you to believe in this amendment that it is about China. Let me be very clear. No United States funds made available to the UNFPA shall be made available for any activities in the People's Republic of China. Our funds are not being used for any activities in China. I do not want them to go to China because they have a policy, we know, that we do not agree with: forced abortion, particularly as it relates to females.

So the bottom line is, none of us is for that, but this has nothing to do with this amendment. UNFPA United States funds do not go to China and will never go to China. It is a backdoor way to hurt a very important program. It is about ending the U.S. participation in the U.N. family planning fund where we have been active since the sixties, and we should be proud of our activities there, because we are saving lives, we are giving health care to people who need it desperately, and we are not controlling the way people think. Why should we? It is their right in their country to support safe, legal abortions if they want. We should not try to gag them as a result of our participation in UNFPA.

So I hope the American people follow this debate, because there is a linkage here to what has gone on in the House today, their attack on a woman's right to choose. They basically ended Roe versus Wade today, because Roe versus Wade said, in the late terms of a pregnancy, after the first trimester, the State shall regulate. They stepped in and took over and reached the long arm of Uncle Sam into every doctor's office in America, disrespecting women, disrespecting families, disrespecting individual rights, disrespecting physicians.

They have gone too far, and now in this bill we face this fight. I hope that my colleagues will support the Leahy-Kassebaum language. It is the language we all agree with. We are not saying in

any way in this bill that Federal funds are going to be used in any way for abortion, but what we are saying with this amendment is that nongovernmental organizations—nongovernmental organizations—operating in other countries have a right to do what they will with their own funds.

As far as UNFPA, they are using this China argument and distorting it. They just want to get us to pull out of this family planning, this very important agency. I hope we will support PATRICK LEAHY on this one.

I ask unanimous consent that the think-globally-act-locally House Republican Agenda be printed in the RECORD.

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

THINK GLOBALLY, ACT LOCALLY—A PRO-ACTIVE, PRO-ENVIRONMENT AGENDA FOR HOUSE REPUBLICANS

INTRODUCTION

As we all know, the environmentalist lobby and their extremist friends in the eco-terrorist underworld have been working overtime to define Republicans and their agenda as anti-environment, pro-polluter, and hostile to the survival of every cuddly critter roaming God's green earth.

While we all know that this characterization of Republicans is far from true, it will continue to be the drumbeat message of the left for as long as it helps them a) grab headlines, b) write fundraising letters, and c) energize people who consider themselves pro-environment.

The new Republican Congress is committed to updating environmental legislation written in the 1960s and 1970s to better address the problems of the 1990s and for the century to come. As we move this agenda based on sound science, results and real clean-up, better use of tax dollars, respect for property rights, and less reliance on lawyers, the establishment environmentalist community in Washington has begun its own fear campaign to preserve the status quo they make a living from.

Although Republicans and the vast majority of the American people believe you can't have a strong economy without a strong environment, and you can't have a strong environment without a strong economy, the extremist environmental movement will stop at nothing to distort the facts, lie about our legislative agenda, and paint you and your fellow Republicans as the insensitive extremists in this fight. And while we will never satisfy the most extreme in the environmental movement, to many in our growing Republican majority—especially suburban women and young people—the environment is an important issue.

In addition to the legislative battle the Conference will help you fight, and win, here in Washington to bring common sense reforms to environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act, Superfund, and Clean Water legislation, there are very real and very effective steps you can take in your districts to help further insulate yourself from the attacks of the green extremists.

As we are ''thinking globally'' about how to improve our nation's environmental laws here in Congress, the steps listed below will help you to ''act locally'' and get involved in your districts on the side of a cleaner environment.

By taking some time to get involved in a variety of pro-environment projects in your communities, you can go over the heads of the elitist environmental movement and work directly with the people who care most about the environment in your communities—your constituents.

The time to act is now. In order to build credibility you must engage this agenda before your opponents can label your efforts ''craven, election year gimmicks.'' Remember, as a famous frog once said, ''it ain't easy being green,'' your constituents will give you more credit for showing up on a Saturday to help clean up the local park or beach than they will give a press release from some Washington-based special interest group.

Think of it this way, the next time Bruce Babbit comes to your district and canoes down a river as a media stunt to tell the press how anti-environment their congressman is, if reporters have been to your boss' adopt-a-highway clean-up, two of his tree plantings, and his Congressional Task Force on Conservation hearings, they'll just laugh Babbit back to Washington.

ACTION ITEMS

I. Tree planting

Whether sponsoring tree planting programs in your district or participating in ongoing tree planting programs, this exercise provides Members with excellent earned media opportunities. When participating in tree planting programs you should include both children and seniors. In addition, while it is important to discuss the positive environmental aspects of planting trees, don't forget the symbolism that trees represent—i.e. roots in the community, family, and district.

Tree planting can occur at schools, parks, public buildings, and even senior centers. If the Member plans on sponsoring his/her own tree planting program, consider, contacting local nurseries who may donate trees for the cause. (Contact the ethics committee prior to undertaking this activity)

II. Special environmental days—Earth Day & Arbor Day

During the year there are at least two days when the ''environment'' is a major news story.

Earth Day—Usually third week in April.

Arbor Day—Proposed in 1996 for April 26th.

During these special environmental days, chances are good that the media will be writing an Earth Day or an Arbor Day story. In addition, chances are also good that somewhere in your district there will be a group sponsoring an event. Plan on participating in these events, or at a minimum, plan on releasing a statement of support. In your statement of support, make sure to include your positive environmental activities.

III. Adopt a highway, walking trail or bike path

While traveling your district, you will no doubt come across ''Adopt a Highway'' signs. This is an excellent program that embodies the Republican philosophy of volunteerism. To participate in this program you should contact your state, county road commission, or local roadway authorities.

In addition to participating in an ''Adopt a Highway'' program, you may also want to participate or initiate an ''Adopt a Walking Trail'' program or ''Adopt a Bike Path'' program. For these type of programs you should contact your local, county, or state parks authorities.

Once you decide to participate in any of these programs, make sure to announce your participation at the site. Stress community involvement in your remarks and have plenty of supporters on cite at the press conference.

IV. Environmental companies

Environmental high tech ''clean up related'' companies or companies that produce products from recycled materials are among the fastest growing industries in America. Through your local Chamber of Commerce or National Federation of Independent Businesses, do some investigative work to seek out environmental related companies in your district. If you have an environmental company in your district, contact the facility and arrange for a tour.

During the tour be sure to invite the media to participate (make sure you receive permission from the facility). Become briefed on the company's mission and offer your support. Chances are, the company will be happy to participate in this earned media opportunity which offers them positive media coverage.

V. Start a conservation task force

One of the best ways to keep informed regarding local environmental issues is to organize a local conservation task force in your district. In addition to keeping you informed on local environmental issues, this group can also assist you in developing an environmental legislative agenda. To set up such a group invite local environmentalists and sportsmen to join. Groups to contact include: garden club members, 4H representatives, Ducks Unlimited members, Audobon members, and other local or grass-roots organizations that are symphathetic to your common sense environmental agenda.

VI. Local conservation groups and boards

What types of environmental groups are already active in your district? Look for zoo boards, garden clubs, or other community conservation/environmental groups in your district. Become an active board member where possible.

VII. Local school participation

Many school curriculums include environmental issues or offer special environmental programs. Find out which schools offer these programs and become a guest lecturer. In your lecture be prepared to offer congressional environmental action highlights as well as a reaffirmation of your commitment to a clean environment.

VIII. Constituent letter data base

Undoubtedly, your office has received environmental related constituents letters. Hopefully, you have coded these letters in your data base. These are constituents who care enough about the environment to take the time to write you and in many cases will appreciate updates from you concerning your environmental agenda. These are also the same people that you can ask to participate in your conservation task force.

IX. Using recycled materials & initiating a recycling program in office

One of the best ways to show your concern about the environment is to lead by example. One way to show this is to announce an office policy which includes purchasing recycled materials and initiating a recycling program in your office. When announcing this new office policy be sure to include local environmentalists who will praise your actions.

X. Recycling facilities in district

Many municipalities and counties have ongoing recycling programs. Seek out those who have these programs and tour the facility or drop off area. If they don't currently have recycling programs, you might want to head up a task force with local officials to implement a municipal or county wide program.

XI. Teddy Roosevelt conservation award

Through his conservation efforts President Teddy Roosevelt is probably known as the Republican's most famous environmentalist. Using his name, consider establishing a yearly ''Teddy Roosevelt Conservation Award''

for someone in your district whose achievements exemplify President Roosevelt's conservation commitment. You can even recognize several award winners by establishing a youth award, a senior award, or a local business conservation award.

Be sure to contact your local media when you establish the award and when you award the winner. To facilitate the process of identifying potential winners. You can involve your local conservation task force and local schools in the decision process.

XII. Environmental PSAs

Members of Congress are important leaders. As such it is both appropriate and encouraged that you speak out on local environmental issues through the use of public service announcements (PSAs).

Suggested environmental PSAs could include:

Proper battery disposal.

Encouraging recycling at home.

Proper motor oil disposal when changing your car's oil.

Encouraging respect for nature when camping or hunting.

Keeping lakes, rivers, and beaches clean by putting garbage in its place.

These PSAs can air on both radio and cable stations. To produce a PSA first contact your local radio and cable stations to inquire if they will run your PSA. When producing PSAs, you can use studios at the radio and cable station or you can use the House Recording Studio.

XIII. Door to door-handing out tree saplings

If your current plans include door to door, consider passing out tree saplings with your door to door pamphlet. Some Members even design the pamphlet so that it is attached to the tree sapling.

This practice demonstrates your commitment to the environment by encouraging the planting of the trees and it provides you with an opportunity to use appropriate language tying your legislative agenda to the ''roots'' you are establishing or growing in your community.

XIV. River, lake, beach, or park clean ups

Through your conservation task force or through already established organizations, consider participating in local river, lake, beach, or park clean ups. Participating in these events will provide you with an opportunity to gain positive media exposure and further demonstrates your commitment to the environment.

XV. Local zoo

Become active in your local zoo. Go for a visit, participate in fundraising events, become active on its citizens advisory board, or help create enthusiasm for special projects it might be promoting.

CONCLUSION

Remember, the environment must be a proactive issue. Congressional staff in both the Washington office and the district office need to concentrate on seeking out environmental opportunities for their boss. Republicans should not be afraid of the environmental extremists—embrace our record and act to promote it.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, and supported by others, Senator LEAHY and Senator BOXER as well.

It seems to me a fundamental proposition that a private organization ought to be able to use its funds overseas for any purpose which it chooses. The Kassebaum amendment provides that there will be no U.S. dollars used to pay for abortion, and, in my view, that ought to take care of the objection of anybody who does not want to have U.S. taxpayer dollars spent on abortions.

But the factor of not limiting a private organization to a standard which is different than the laws of the host country seems to me to be fundamental. Were these moneys to be spent in another country, let the laws of those countries determine what is appropriate. To try to impose a limitation under the so-called Mexico City policy, the House language, which would prohibit United States dollars to organizations which are bilateral or multilateral, where those organizations use their own funds for whatever purposes, including abortion, seems to me to be a matter which is really within the purview of those private organizations. What concerns me, Mr. President, is that this controversy is part of a broader controversy which has engulfed the U.S. Senate and the House on the confirmation of Dr. Henry Foster, where he was not even given a vote on confirmation in the Senate because he performed medical procedures—abortions—permitted by the U.S. Constitution; a debate on an appropriations bill about whether women in prison would be able to have abortions at public expense, where they were necessary, in the judgment of the doctor, for medical purposes or where that woman might have been a victim of incest; even under the restrictive language of limiting the language of abortion to incest, rape, or the life of the mother. It is not just whether funds ought to be available if a woman in a Federal prison is unable to earn any money or to take care of her own medical needs, and she is denied a medical procedure—an abortion—if she is the victim of incest, or the issue about having medical procedures—abortions—available for women in overseas medical installations.

There is really a broad scale attack on a woman's right to choose, a constitutional right that is recognized by the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States—not going back to Roe versus Wade in 1973, but a decision handed down in Casey versus Planned Parenthood by the Supreme Court in 1992, an opinion written by three Justices appointed by Republican Presidents, Reagan and Bush, an opinion written by Justices Souter, O'Connor, and Anthony Kennedy.

So I hope that we will not further limit the right of a private organization to use their own funds for overseas purposes, even if they include abortion, simply because that U.S. organization may have U.S. funds for totally separate and collateral purposes.

MILITARY ACTION IN BOSNIA

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this is a subject which has been spoken about on our floor and has been the subject of action by the House—that is, the subject of not having military action in Bosnia, which utilizes United States troops without prior consent by the Congress of the United States. This is a very, very important subject, Mr. President, for many reasons.

We have learned from the bitter experience of Vietnam that the United States cannot successfully wage a war which does not have public backing, and the first indicia of public backing is approval by the Congress of the United States.

We have deviated from the constitutional requirement that only the Congress can declare war. In Korea, we had a conflict, a war without a declaration of war and, again, in Vietnam. When a Republican President, President George Bush, wanted to act under Presidential authority to move into the gulf with military action, I was one of many Senators who stood on this floor and objected to that, because it was a matter that ought to have been initiated only with congressional action.

Finally, in January 1991, in a historic debate on this floor, the Congress of the United States authorized the use of force, and I supported that policy for the use of force. But the more important principle involved was that the President could not act unilaterally, could not act on his own.

Similarly, I think that is a mandatory consideration on the Bosnian situation. I have disagreed—many of us have—with the President's policy in Bosnia. On this floor, I have said on a number of occasions, as have others, that the arms embargo against the Bosnian Moslems was bad public policy, that the Bosnian Moslems ought to be able to defend themselves against Serbian atrocities.

After the Senate voted overwhelmingly to lift that embargo, and the House voted overwhelmingly to lift that embargo, only then did the President become involved in the Bosnian situation and effectuated a policy of United States airstrikes. And I, among many others, argued with the administration and the military leaders that we should have undertaken airstrikes to use U.S. military power in a way which did not put large numbers of our troops at risk.

We were told by the administration and by military leaders that air power without ground support would be ineffective. But, finally, when the administration was faced with no alternative, except to face a possible override on their veto of the legislation lifting the arms embargo, then, and only then, was air power employed, and very, very effectively. I believe that the use of U.S. air power is entirely appropriate, but the use of ground forces is not.

We have seen the policy in Somalia, where this administration went beyond