

estimated 50 million families around the globe use family planning as a direct result of U.S. population assistance programs.

Unfortunately, passage of the continuing resolution on January 26 came at a terrible price to U.S. population assistance programs. Time and time again during consideration of the foreign operations appropriations bill, the Senate resisted the efforts of the House to restore the Mexico City policy and to impose restrictions on funding for United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA]. Finally, opponents to family planning in the House unveiled a new, ugly strategy—slashing population assistance in the continuing resolution [CR]. Tragically, the need to avoid another Government shutdown led many Members to vote for the CR and accept what was understood to be an extremely painful funding cut. It was only later that the truly insidious nature of this provision became apparent, when it became known that this provision would simply devastate—if not obliterate—U.S.-funded international family planning programs.

Under the terms of the CR, none of the funds appropriated for international family planning can be spent until July 1. After this date, funding may be provided at 65 percent of the fiscal year 1995 level, appropriated on a monthly basis of 6.7 percent for 15 months. As a result, U.S. population assistance expenditures could drop from \$547 million last year, to only \$72 million during fiscal year 1996. This means a loss of revenue to the program of \$475 million.

The Alan Guttmacher Institute, Planned Parenthood, and other population groups predict that as a result of these cuts, at a minimum, seven million couples in developing countries who would have used modern contraceptives will be left without access to family planning. Four million more women will experience unintended pregnancies. We can also expect 1.9 million more unplanned births, often to families living in terrible poverty and who cannot afford another child; 1.6 million more abortions and countless miscarriages; 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth, including those from unsafe abortions; and 134,000 infant deaths.

It appears that supporters of these funding cuts are unaware that current law prohibits the use of any U.S. funds for abortion-related activities. This is not about encouraging abortion. It is about preventing unwanted pregnancies and preventing abortions. It is about helping women to space their children, so that they and their children are healthier, because children born within 2 years of their mother's last birth are twice as likely to die in infancy than those born after a longer interval. It is about families being able to support themselves and emerge from terrible poverty. It is about preventing maternal and infant death. It is an issue that should unite Members on both sides of the abortion debate.

Because of the CR, organizations that provide family planning services with U.S. funds are already determining which of their programs will have to be cut or eliminated. For example, a local affiliate of international planned parenthood in Brazil estimates that 250,000 couples who rely on its services will lose access to family planning and related health care. In Peru, a country that is among the poorest in Latin America and where 90 percent of women surveyed say they want to prevent or delay another pregnancy, more than 200,000 couples will lose services. Families in these extremely poor countries cannot afford to lose vital U.S. family planning assistance.

As a conferee for the State Department reauthorization bill, I worked hard to prevent the inclusion of House language reinstating the Mexico City policy and restrictions on UNFPA funding. Thankfully, we prevailed and the House capitulated on this front. Now it is time to take this important battle to take the next step and undue the harm caused by the House appropriators.

I am pleased to say that my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, who has been such a champion in fighting for international family planning throughout his career, included language in the omnibus appropriations bill which would restore funding for U.S. population assistance. The Hatfield provision would nullify the funding cuts in the CR if the President certifies that they will lead to a significant increase in abortions. I applaud Senator HATFIELD for his outstanding leadership on the Appropriations Committee and for his dedication to this very important issue.

The United States has been a model nation on international family planning issues, and other countries look to our example. The implications of the cuts to U.S. aid contained in the CR are far broader than one might think. If other countries follow our lead, the impact will be devastating to the health of women and families of developing nations.

So, in honor of International Women's Day, I urge my colleagues to support the restoration of funding for international family planning. Hanging in the balance are the lives, the health, and the economic survival of women, children, and families throughout the world.●

HONORING MATTHEW EISENFELD

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise today following the death of Matthew Eisenfeld of West Hartford in the terrorist bombing in Israel. The four most recent terrorist attacks have not only threatened the fragile peace in this region, but also resulted in the death of one of our own. Matthew was a bright and caring individual who spoke out for peace in the Middle East—and his voice ultimately will not be silenced unless

we give into those who use vicious acts of violence to derail efforts for peace in this region.

Throughout his short life, Matthew had a strong impact on the lives of the people he met. Clearly, he was a fine student with a good heart. He dedicated himself to others and worked hard to learn and follow the teachings of the Jewish faith.

It seems ironic that at the time of his death, Matthew was working on a haggadah, the traditional book of freedom and liberation read at Passover. He truly believed that the land of Israel that he loved so much would one day be at peace.

Following the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, Matthew was asked to speak at a memorial service for the slain leader. His message was full of hope that the Middle East peace process would continue. Even in the dark days immediately following the death of the Prime Minister, Matthew stood up and called on those gathered not to give up hope and stressed the necessity of continuing the work of Mr. Rabin.

We have now lost another decent and caring man whose life was a testament to peace. This is a tragedy not only for Matthew's family and friends, but also for the countless number of people who could have met Matthew and learned from him if this senseless act of hate had not occurred. We must remember Matthew's love of humanity and continue to work to spread his message of peace and hope. Soundly condemning these senseless acts of violence while rededicating ourselves to the peace process, is the finest way to honor Matthew Eisenfeld's life and the other innocent men and women who have lost their lives in these terrible bombings.●

WANTED: JOBS OF LAST RESORT

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the things I have stressed repeatedly on the floor of the Senate is that without having a jobs component for people of limited skills, welfare reform is a sham. It is public relations for those of us who hold public office, not help for people on welfare and not help for the taxpayers.

Recently, Prof. Sheldon Danziger and Peter Gottschalk had an item on the New York Times op-ed page, titled "Wanted: Jobs of Last Resort." I ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I highly recommend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

WANTED: JOBS OF LAST RESORT

(By Sheldon Danziger and Peter Gottschalk)

Members of the National Governors' Association were on Capitol Hill yesterday, once again pressing their case for welfare reform. The group has captured glowing reviews from both President Clinton and Congressional Republicans for a package of proposals that would favor block grants to the states over a guarantee of Federal aid.

Liberal Democrats in the House have criticized the plan, saying its cuts in Federal spending are simply too hard on the poor. But they have not given enough attention to