

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) designates the year of 2002 as the “Year of the Rose”; and

(2) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. REID, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. CHAFEE):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the United States Agency for International Development relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, on February 15, the United States Agency for International Development issued Contract Information Bulletin 01-03 regarding the “Restoration of the Mexico City Policy.”

This bulletin reinstates the international gag rule, which prohibits international family planning organizations that receive federal funding from using their own privately-raised funds to counsel women about abortion, provide abortion services, and lobby on reproductive rights.

Today, I am introducing, along with Senators REID, SNOWE, JEFFORDS, COLLINS, SPECTER, and CHAFEE, a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act.

As my colleagues know, the CRA establishes a procedure for the expedited consideration of a resolution disapproving an agency rule.

I can think of no other case where expedited procedures are more appropriate. Women’s lives are at stake.

Approximately 78,000 women throughout the world die each year as a result of unsafe abortions. At least one-fourth of all unsafe abortions in the world are to girls aged 15-19. By 2015, contraceptive needs in developing countries will grow by more than 40 percent.

As a result of the gag rule, the organizations that are reducing unsafe abortions and providing contraceptives will be forced either to limit their services or to simply close their doors to women across the world. And this will cause women and families increased misery and death.

Make no mistake, the international gag rule will restrict family planning, not abortions. In fact, no United States funds can be used for abortion services. That is already law, and has been since 1973. This gag rule does, however, restrict foreign organizations in ways that would be unconstitutional here at home and that is why we seek to reverse it in an expedited fashion under the CRA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 9

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the United States Agency for International Development relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy (contained in Contract Information Bulletin 01-03, dated February 15, 2001), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BOXER in introducing a joint resolution of congressional disapproval relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy.

We are taking this step because the global gag rule—which denies funding to any organization that uses its own funds to provide or promote abortion services overseas—is an ill-conceived, anti-woman, and anti-American policy.

The President’s rationale for reimposing the gag rule was that he wanted to make abortions more rare. Yet the last time the Mexico City Policy was in effect, there was no reduction in the number of abortions, only reduced access to quality health care services, more unintended pregnancies and more abortions. Research shows that the only way to reduce the need for abortion is to improve family planning efforts that will decrease the number of unintended pregnancies. Access to contraception reduces the probability of having an abortion by 85 percent.

It the only reason to repeal the Mexico City Policy was to decrease the need for abortions then that would be enough. But our support of international family planning programs literally means the difference between life or death for women in developing countries. At least one woman dies every minute of every day from causes related to pregnancy and child birth in developing nations. This means that almost 600,000 women die every year from causes related to pregnancy. Family planning efforts that prevent unintended pregnancies save the lives of thousands of women and infants each year.

In addition to reducing maternal and infant mortality rates, family planning helps prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. This effort is particularly critical considering that the World Health Organization has estimated that 5.9 million individuals, the majority of whom live in developing nations, become infected with HIV almost every year.

Let me be clear: We are not asking to use one single taxpayer dollar to perform or promote abortion overseas. The law has explicitly prohibited such activities since 1973. Instead, the Mexico City Policy would restrict foreign organizations in a way that would be unconstitutional in the United States. The Mexico City Policy violates a fundamental tenet of our democracy—freedom of speech. Exporting a policy that is unconstitutional at home is the ultimate act of hypocrisy. Surely this is not the message we want to send to struggling democracies who are looking to the United States for guidance.

When President Bush reinstated the Mexico City Policy, he turned the clock back on women around the world by almost two decades. Today, Senator BOXER and I are looking toward the future and taking the first step to repeal this antiquated, anti-woman policy.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 115. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

SA 116. Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 117. Mr. BENNETT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 118. Mr. SMITH, of Oregon proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 119. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 120. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 121. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 122. Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORZINE and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 115. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. MODIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) INCREASED LIMITS FOR INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “No person” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (i), no person”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) INCREASED LIMIT TO ALLOW RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

“(1) INCREASE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the opposition personal funds amount with respect to a candidate for election to the office of Senator exceeds the threshold amount, the limit under subsection (a)(1)(A) (in this subsection referred to as the ‘applicable limit’) with respect to that candidate shall be the increased limit.

“(B) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—

“(i) STATE-BY-STATE COMPETITIVE AND FAIR CAMPAIGN FORMULA.—In this subsection, the threshold amount with respect to an election cycle of a candidate described in subparagraph (A) is an amount equal to the sum of—

“(I) \$150,000; and

“(II) \$0.04 multiplied by the voting age population.