

we talk about something other than what helps men? Viagra is in all the newspapers, trying to make a decision as to whether or not insurance companies should pay for this. Why don't we talk about why insurance companies shouldn't pay for contraceptives, health care providers shouldn't pay for contraceptives? It seems that would be a step in the right direction. Over half of the insurance companies, health care providers, do not cover this.

Our legislation, that of the senior Senator from Maine and me, would require insurers, HMOs, and employee health benefit plans that offer prescription drug benefits to cover contraceptive drugs approved by the FDA. This is long overdue.

I am just telling everyone here that if we do not have the benefit of some hearings on this—the senior Senator from Maine and I have written letters, and we have asked people, and we cannot get the benefit of a hearing. This should not be. It would seem to me we should have a hearing with the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

I have had the benefit of speaking to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been very concerned about issues like this in the past. And at last resort, we will go to the Appropriations Committee and have a hearing there. We should not have it there, but at last resort we will have it there. I do not think it is appropriate that we have to legislate on appropriations bills, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, on this, I am going to offer an amendment on the appropriate bill if we do not get some action by the proper authorizing committee. This is simply unfair—unfair—what is going on.

The same newspaper yesterday, in a different article, said:

Health insurers that cover the new impotence drug Viagra but don't pay for female contraception are guilty of "gender bias," says the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists today.

"Pregnancy is a medical condition, just like impotence. And the cost benefit of preventing pregnancy is much greater than treating impotence," says ACOG spokeswoman Luella Klein of Emory University.

Mr. President, it simply is unfair. Over this last decade, we have moved forward a little bit with the help of the junior Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI. She and I have worked together. We now have a program at the National Institutes of Health that deals with women's conditions.

But, Mr. President, over the years diseases that afflict women have been ignored. Interstitial cystitis—it is a disease that afflicts 500,000 women in America, a very serious disease of the bladder—until 8 years ago, there was not a penny spent on it for research. They said it was in a woman's head. They learned that is not the case. Now, as a result of work done at the National Institutes of Health, they have a drug that cures the effects of this on 40 percent of the women.

Multiple sclerosis, intercervical and ovarian cancer, and breast cancer, and

lupus—these diseases, for research, are basically ignored because they are diseases basically related to women principally.

I am saying here, this is really unfair what is going on here. We are spending so much time with all kinds of jokes on all the talk radio programs, all the TV programs, about Viagra. But it is not a joke that we have over 3.6 million unintended pregnancies, with 44 percent ending in abortion, in this country. And a lot of them are caused simply—in fact, the majority of them—simply because women cannot afford things like the pill.

We have to do something. Not only does it affect that, Mr. President, but a reduction in unintended pregnancies will lead to a reduction in infant mortality, low-birth-weight babies, and maternal morbidity. In fact, the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality determined that, "Infant mortality could be reduced by [more than] 10 percent if all women not desiring pregnancy used contraception."

So I think it is, again, unfair that tubal ligation, abortion, vasectomies, are covered and the pill, contraceptives, and contraceptive devices are not covered. In my opinion, we need to move this forward. We have the support of approximately 35 Senators in this body. We need a hearing, and we need to have this legislation passed.

I express my appreciation to the Senator from New York for allowing me to go before him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

#### NUCLEAR TESTING IN INDIA

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as the Senate will know, the Government of India has announced that two further underground nuclear tests occurred at 3:51, eastern daylight time, this morning. These follow the three underground explosions announced on Monday.

Now, this might at first seem a reckless act on the part of the Government of India. But, sir, I would call attention to a statement in an Associated Press report which reads, "The Government said its testing was now complete and it was prepared to consider a ban on such nuclear testing."

Sir, this could be a statement of transcendent importance. It would be useful at this time, when tempers—and I use the word "temper"—are rising in the West, to recall the outrage when France carried out a series of underwater tests in the South Pacific in Mururoa Atoll on September 5, 1995, to the indignation of many other nations, but thereupon signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty the following year. And, sir, it has not only signed that treaty, it has ratified it.

The United States was among the convening nations in 1996 that signed the treaty, but this Senate has not ratified the treaty. The People's Republic of China followed much the

same course in completing a series of tests and then agreeing to the test ban treaty.

Just now the press is reporting all manner of administration officials are distressed that the Central Intelligence Agency did not report indications that these tests were about to take place and that somehow we were taken off guard. But I repeat a comment I made to Tim Weiner of the New York Times yesterday that it might help if the American foreign relations community would learn to read.

The BJP Party, the Bharatiya Janata Party—now in office for essentially the first time—leads the ruling coalition and has long been militantly asserting that India was going to be a nuclear power like the other great powers of the world. It is the second most populous nation. In the election platform—technically, a manifesto in the Indian-English usage—issued before the last election, the BJP had this to say: "The BJP rejects the notion of nuclear apartheid and will actively oppose attempts to impose a hegemonistic nuclear regime. . . We will not be dictated to by anybody in matters of security requirements and in the exercise of the nuclear option."

This is hugely important, as is indicated by the enormous ground swell of support in India itself in the aftermath of Monday's explosion.

In the platform put together by the coalition that now governs in India, there is a statement, not quite as assertive, but not less so. This is the National Agenda for Governance, issued 18 March 1998. It says, "To ensure the security, territorial integrity and unity of India we will take all necessary steps and exercise all available options. Toward that end we will re-evaluate the nuclear policy and exercise the option to induct nuclear weapons." That is an Indian-English term, "induct," as in induction into the military. It means to bring them into an active place in the Nation's military arsenal.

Now, the President, who is in Germany, announced today that we would impose the sanctions required under law, the Glenn amendment of 1994, directed against non-declared nuclear nations that begin nuclear testing. This is the law and the Indians knew it perfectly well, even if we have, perhaps, been insufficiently attentive to bringing to their minds the implications of the law. Chancellor Kohl—Germany being a large supplier of aid to India—was with President Clinton when this was said. We should not underestimate the degree to which this might just arouse further resentment in India.

The law is there, but also the resentment is there. In this National Agenda for Governance that I just recited, there are a number of platform "planks," you might say principles. The second on economy reads: "We will continue with the reform process to give a strong Swadeshi thrust to ensure that the national economy grows

on the principle that India shall be built by Indians." Swadeshi is a turn of the century term of the independence movement meaning self-reliance, use indigenous materials, sweep imports out.

They are not going to be as intimidated by sanctions as we may suppose. This is the first Hindu government in India in perhaps 800 years. We tend to forget that. When we go to visit India, distinguished persons are taken to view the Taj Mahal, the Red Fort, the India Gate. All those are monuments by conquerors—Islamic, then English. It is something we don't notice. They do. And after 50 years of Indian independence, founded by a secular government which denied all those things, there is now a Hindu government and its sensibilities need to be attended to if only as a matter of common sense.

Do we want India in a system of nuclear arms control or don't we? I think we do. I think we ought to encourage them and explore the implications of the statement reported by the Associated Press. And while we are at it, it would do no great harm to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty ourselves.

I see my friend from Nebraska is on the floor. I look forward to a comment he might make.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question. First of all, I don't think there is anybody in the Senate who has been more consistently critical of the Central Intelligence Agency and has been more diligent in trying to change the way we classify documents. I find both of them to be a bit connected to his comments.

One of the concerns I have in all this is that we look for a scapegoat. Now, one of the things that citizens need to understand is that increasingly we are getting our intelligence through open sources. That is good because when you get your information through open sources there is a debate. Is what somebody said true or not true—and you debate such things.

I quite agree with what the Senator said earlier that for us to be going at the CIA right now because they didn't report this is a little ridiculous. All we have to do is read articles of John Burns over a half dozen months.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Of the New York Times.

Mr. KERREY. If we head in the direction of finding a scapegoat here what we will miss is an opportunity to debate what our policy ought to be toward the largest democracy on Earth. In addition to the other things that the Senator said about India, this is also the largest democracy. A billion people live in India. Not an easy country to govern.

They have a Hindu nationalist party that campaigned on a platform, and that platform was that nuclear testing would resume. They were not secretive about that. They did not operate in the shadows on that. They were upfront and they followed through.

It seems to me we should blame ourselves for not paying attention to what is going on there and blame ourselves for not giving enough consideration or concern about the direction of the largest democracy on Earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator his 10 minutes has expired.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KERREY. I am at the end of my question, Mr. President.

I just wanted, in addition to making the point that the distinguished Senator has been very critical of the CIA—and I think he is quite right in this particular instance to say though we may need some questions answered, the biggest question is why didn't anybody in either the administration or in this Congress notice that the Hindu nationalist party had campaigned on a promise to make India a nuclear power. What does the distinguished Senator from New York think this Congress needs to do to make certain that we are paying attention in the aftermath of these sanctions to what India is doing, to make certain that, first, we don't miss an opportunity to get them to ratify this treaty, and in addition, to get them to do a number of other things that not only would be in their best interests, but to be in our best interests, as well, since a third of the Earth's population lives between India and China in this very, very volatile region to which we obviously have not paid a sufficient amount of attention.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Well, I would say to my gallant, able friend that the Intelligence Committee could do worse than inviting some of the administration officials who are so indignant that the CIA didn't tell them what was going to happen up to say: have you read any Indian newspaper recently? Do you happen to know what the largest democracy in the world is and who they elected in the last election? Have you looked into their party platforms.

Mr. KERREY. Personally, I think it would be a waste of money to direct the CIA to read the New York Times and report to us what is contained in there relevant to any part of the world, let alone in India.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I much agree. May I say to my friend that I was Ambassador to India on May 18, 1974, when the Indians exploded a "peaceful" nuclear explosion, as they said, in India on the same testing grounds used this time. It fell on me to call on then Prime Minister Gandhi to express our concerns. I have to say that Secretary Kissinger was mild; he toned down the indignation that came from the Department of State in his draft statement. I did say to Mr. Gandhi on that occasion, speaking for myself, without instructions, that India had made a great mistake, that it was the No. 1 country in south Asia, the hegemonic country in South Asia, Pakistan No. 3,

if you like, then you go down to the Maldives, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka; but in 25 years time there would be a Mongol general in Islamabad with a nuclear capacity, saying, I have got four bombs and I want the Punjab back and I want this region or that region, the Kashmir, or else I will drop them on what was then Bombay, New Delhi, Madras and Calcutta.

Well, something like that is happening and we better see that it doesn't go forward. So to explore the Indian offer here, suggesting the offer, seems to me, a matter of huge importance. We could see the end of the cold war, followed by a nuclear proliferation of a kind we never conceived. We can see China, North Korea, and Pakistan arming in nuclear modes against India and Russia and us looking at an Armageddonic future that we had felt was behind us.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I know the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has come here for other reasons. He used to be chairman of the Intelligence Committee. I know from listening to him that he has an active interest in this issue as well. I have heard him comment many times. In fact, he asked the administration officials why they don't attempt to resolve the conflicts between India and Pakistan and India and China, and why do we not pay more attention to it. I suspect the Senator from Pennsylvania would rather not spend too much time commenting on it, but by coincidence, we have another individual on the floor who has an active interest in this issue.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend. I ask unanimous consent that the time from 1:45 p.m. to 2 o'clock be reserved for the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from New York for his comments about the problems with nuclear proliferation. I thank my colleague from Nebraska for commenting about discussions that we have had over the years about the issues of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I intend to speak directly to a subject that I had talked to the Senator from Nebraska about, and that is the need to have activism by the President of the United States in trying to deal with nuclear proliferation on the subcontinent. In fact, Senator Hank Brown and I had visited with Indian Prime Minister Rao in August of 1995 and also with Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. I then wrote to the President on this precise subject. I