

TALKING POINTS ON U.N. ARREARS-FAMILY PLANNING AGREEMENT

November 15, 1999

The agreement reached between the White House and Congress meets our goals of paying our UN arrears with no negative impact on family planning programs. It is a positive step because:

1. **It will not interfere with family planning programs.** The compromise restrictions imposed by Congress will not have a substantial impact on family planning programs in place around the world.
2. **It allows the President to waive the restrictions.** The U.S. will spend \$385 million this year on international family planning programs. Under the agreement, if the President chooses to waive the restrictions imposed by Congress, a 3% cut in funding would result.
3. **It greatly benefits poor women and children by increasing debt relief and forgiveness.** Under this agreement, the IMF's debt relief and forgiveness efforts to the world's poorest nations will be expanded. By providing for \$90 million in international debt relief, the bill will help improve economic conditions for poor women and children around the world.
4. **It paves the way for us to pay our UN dues.** We have worked for 7 years to pay our U.N. arrears. Faced with the threat of losing our vote in the UN General Assembly, it became critical that we reach a compromise with Congress to settle our UN arrears. Under this agreement, the UN will receive \$926 million over 3 years.
5. **It allows us to carry out the President's family planning policy around the world.** By settling our UN arrears, and thereby maintaining our vote in the UN General Assembly, the U.S. is guaranteed a strong voice in carrying out the Administration's family planning policy around the world.
6. **It protects our national security interests and world leadership role.** By meeting our obligations to the UN, we can be confident that our national security interests will be protected, and that the U.S. will continue to maintain a leadership role within the UN and around the world.
7. **It will not go into permanent law.** The agreement is only effective for this fiscal year - it will expire on October 1, 2000.

The President remains committed to supporting international family planning and a woman's right to choose.

International Family Planning

This file contains:

- A memo that argues that the Smith Population Program Compromise cuts international family planning, thwarts free speech, and impedes the promotion of democratic values
- A memo that advocates supporting the restoration of the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
- The United Nations Population Fund Whip List
- A breakdown of Congressional members supporting or opposing International Family Planning Policy
- Two articles published in Population Action International that discuss why the U.S. should restore funding for UNFPA and why the global gag rule undermines U.S. foreign policy and harms women's health

**The Smith Population Program “Compromise:”
Cut International Family Planning,
Thwart Free Speech,
Impede the Promotion of Democratic Values**

Like the original Smith proposal, this one still would disqualify foreign nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) from receiving U.S. family planning assistance if they – with their own funds – perform legal abortions or “engage in ... effort[s] to alter the laws or government policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated or prohibited.”

The “compromise” would allow the President to waive the ban on the performance of abortions. But as a consequence, funding for family planning assistance from all USAID sources would be cut by \$44 million to \$356 million overall. Both the funding cap and the policy restrictions would be written into permanent statutory law.

The ban on speech and public information about abortion – whether pro or con -- could not be waived.

The so-called “lobby” ban, in fact, would go well beyond the common understanding of that term. The Smith language states that the ban “include[s] not only overt lobbying for such changes [in abortion laws], but also such other activities as sponsoring...conferences and workshops on the alleged defects in the abortion laws, as well as the drafting and distribution of materials or public statements calling attention to such alleged defects”

- This proposal can only lead to more, not fewer, abortions, since it would result in cutting the funding for family planning therefore diminishing access to the single most effective means of reducing abortion.
- According to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, the ban on speech “is basically a gag rule that would punish organizations for engaging in the democratic process in foreign countries and for engaging in legal activities that would be protected by the First Amendment if carried out in the United States.”
- The Gag Rule is **anti-democratic** because a foreign NGO’s eligibility for U.S. funds would be conditioned on the staff’s willingness to be silent concerning a legitimate and critical public policy debate in their own country with their own funds about policy that affects them. Stifling the public debate – regardless of

Examples of activities – *paid for with non-U.S. funds* – that would cause foreign NGOs or multilateral institutions to lose or be disqualified from US government support for their family planning efforts under Smith Gag Rule

While advertised as a lobby ban, the Smith restriction actually goes far beyond limiting the basic right to engage in advocacy.

- **Ban on materials:**

A family planning association in Bolivia “drafts” and “distributes” a paper observing that half of all women in the La Paz maternity hospital are there being treated for the complications of having had illegal abortions, thus calling attention to the “defects” in Bolivia’s abortion law.

- **Ban on “public statements:”**

The president of an NGO in the Philippines that provides only natural family planning is antiabortion. She would violate the Smith gag rule if she gives a radio interview – makes a “public statement” – endorsing an antiabortion bill pending in the Philippine parliament. (The bill, which is supported by the health ministry, would define abortion as a crime equivalent to murder and punishable by the death penalty.)

- **Ban on “altering government policy:”**

The physicians who head the Russian Family Planning Association offer advice to their own government on how to “alter policy” to make abortion services-- already legal in that country -- safer. Many abortions in Russia still are performed under unsanitary and unhealthy conditions, causing unacceptably high rates of illness. While not addressing Russia’s abortion *law*, these physicians would jeopardize their U.S. family planning support by seeking to alter “government policy” on abortion.

This would set back the enormous progress made, thanks to donor assistance including USAID, in shifting Russians’ reliance on abortion as a method of birth control towards use of contraception as a preferred means of controlling fertility. With the advent of contraceptive services there in 1988, the number of abortions has plummeted from 4.6 million annually to 2.5 million in 1997.

- **Ban on “altering laws:”**

Nepal, where abortion is completely illegal, may be the only country in the world that prosecutes women under its abortion law. Indeed, two-thirds of the women in Nepalese prisons are there for having had abortions. One is a 15-year-old rape victim whose family helped her terminate her pregnancy. She is now serving a twenty-year prison term for having had an abortion while the rapist remains free. The Family Planning Association of Nepal, whose primary mission is the provision of contraceptive services, is seeking to change its country’s abortion law at least to the extent that the women are not prosecutable for committing homicide.

Even antiabortion advocates in the U.S. maintain they oppose punishing the women, but under the Smith gag rule, the leading NGO advocating for the rights of these women in Nepal would be punished by the U.S. government.

SUPPORT RESTORATION OF U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND (UNFPA)

The Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights reported a State Department authorization bill (H.R. 1211) that effectively prohibits any U.S. contribution to UNFPA. During full committee markup in the International Relations Committee, Rep. Tom Campbell (R-CA) will offer an amendment to strike the language in the bill and to restore a U.S. contribution to UNFPA.

The Campbell substitute prevents U.S. funds from being used by UNFPA in China and reduces the U.S. contribution dollar-for-dollar by the amount UNFPA spends in China, unless the President certifies that the UNFPA program in China is being implemented in a totally voluntary manner. Pro-family planning members should support this substitute amendment and reject the restrictions on UNFPA contained in the subcommittee-reported bill, which would prevent a U.S. contribution to UNFPA.

Provisions of the Campbell Amendment

The substitute amendment authorizes the appropriation of a \$25 million contribution to UNFPA in FY 2000 and \$35 million in FY 2001 under a strict set of conditions. None of the U.S. contribution to UNFPA may be used in China, and U.S. funds are maintained in a segregated account and may not be commingled with other UNFPA funds. UNFPA must also certify that it does not fund abortion. In addition, the U.S. contribution will be reduced dollar-for-dollar by the amount UNFPA spends in China unless the President certifies that UNFPA's country program in China:

- focuses on improving the delivery of voluntary family planning information and services;
- conforms to internationally recognized human rights principles;
- implements activities only in 32 counties in China where all targets and quotas have been abolished and coercive practices eliminated;
- works in consultation with and under the oversight of its Executive Board, composed of representatives of 36 member-states including the United States;
- subjects itself to regular independent monitoring; and
- suspends operations in any county found to be in violation of program guidelines.

Reasons to Support the Campbell Substitute:

- **The subcommittee-reported bill guarantees that no U.S. contribution to UNFPA will be possible.** Since UNFPA has had a program in China since January 1998 and even Chinese officials at their most defensive would not assert that no coerced abortions have taken place during the last year, the President cannot make either of the certifications required by the subcommittee-reported-bill. A continuation of the UNFPA funding cutoff, therefore, is not in doubt under the language. The Campbell substitute provides reasonable certification requirements.
- **Under the substitute, no U.S. funds can be used by UNFPA in China or for coercive activities.** One can only conclude that the true motivation of those who would insist on subcommittee-reported language is to prevent U.S. funding of UNFPA and to punish family planning programs in the more than 140 other developing countries in which UNFPA works.
- **UNFPA is subjected to restrictions much more punitive than those imposed on other multilateral organizations working in countries guilty of human rights abuses.** If the President fails to make the required certification under the substitute, the U.S. contribution to UNFPA will be reduced dollar-for-dollar by the amount UNFPA spends in China. The U.S. contributions to other

UN agencies are reduced only by the United States proportionate share of the agency's program in the offending countries.

- **UNFPA is in no way connected to reported family planning abuses in China.** Nearly all UNFPA assistance to China is administered by other UN organizations and by international non-governmental organizations. There is no reason to believe, and no evidence has ever been presented, that any international agency has been complicit in Chinese human rights abuses. Specifically, as confirmed by foreign aid officials during the Reagan Administration, UNFPA does not fund abortion or support coercive practices in any country, including China.
- **UNFPA does not condone or "cover up" coercion in China.** When it considered renewal of the program in China, UNFPA's 36-member Executive Board carefully reviewed the program for its consistency with the human rights principles adopted at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) and found it worthy of support. Most major donor countries believe that the Fund's emphasis on voluntary family planning is an important reason for UNFPA to continue to operate in China and that UNFPA's presence fosters international exposure and dialogue on objectionable Chinese practices.
- **The U.S. government should not, as a matter of principle, hold family planning and UNFPA hostage to a legitimate concern about the conduct of the Chinese government.** There is well-founded concern about China's family planning program—not UNFPA's. Therefore, these concerns should be placed on the U.S.-China bilateral agenda, along with other important human rights issues, and linked as appropriate to trade and other negotiations.

Background

UNFPA became a major target of U.S. anti-abortion groups following media reports of widespread coercion in the implementation of China's "one-child" policy beginning in 1984. Family planning opponents succeeded in pressuring the Reagan and Bush administrations to withhold U.S. support starting in 1986 because of the Fund's presence in China. In 1993, President Clinton, using his authority under the foreign aid legislation, restored funding to UNFPA on the condition that no U.S. funds can be used by UNFPA in China, and Congress has approved a contribution to UNFPA in every subsequent year through FY 1998. Last year, however, Congress explicitly prohibited a U.S. contribution to UNFPA in the FY 1999 omnibus spending bill after UNFPA initiated a new country program in China after a two-year hiatus.

UNFPA's country program in China

The 32 counties where the UNFPA country program in China is operating are intended to serve as models, demonstrating to the Chinese government that couples will rationally plan their families even in the absence of government incentives and disincentives. The focus is on expanding the range of available contraceptive methods; training health workers in interpersonal counseling skills, informed consent procedures, and family planning methods; expanding safe delivery services and prenatal and postpartum care; and improving sexually-transmitted disease prevention efforts.

The new program evolved during three years of consultations between UNFPA and the Chinese government, which requested assistance from the United Nations as it is entitled to as a member state. The two parties agreed that program activities would be conducted in accordance with the principles adopted by the world community at the ICPD, which strongly condemned the use of any form of coercion in national population programs.

UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND WHIP LIST

Attached is a preliminary whip list constructed using members voting records on international population and family planning programs. For the new members of the 106th Congress, members are categorized by what is known about their positions on relevant issues such as domestic reproductive rights.

The classifications used in the whip list are based for incumbent members principally on their votes on seven international population and family planning votes—two pure family planning funding votes and five population policy votes (Mexico City/global gag rule, UNFPA)—that took place during the 105th Congress. Co-sponsors of H.R. 895 are underlined.

What the Classifications Mean

Pro	Solidly supportive voting record, in most cases perfect.
Leans Pro	Fairly consistent supporter but some questions about reliability based on votes in prior Congresses or on related domestic issues.
Mixed	Voted in favor of international family planning on the two funding votes (February 1997 vote to release blocked family planning funds and September 1997 vote on Paul amendment to eliminate all funding). On policy issues usually vote for <u>both</u> the pro-family planning substitute and the underlying Smith anti-family planning amendment.
Leans Con	Voted in favor of international family planning on the two funding votes but voted with anti-family planning members on the five policy-related votes.
Con	Solidly opposed voting record in most cases (except for about 40 members who were not prepared to vote to eliminate all family planning funding under the Paul amendment).

Note: A small number of members are categorized according to specific information that is available on their views concerning UNFPA, such as Reps. Cooksey and Crowley.

4/21/99

REMOVED 5/20/99

Republicans—UNFPA Amendment

Pro (29)

Bass 55206
 Biggert 53515
Bilbray 52040
Boehlert 53665
Campbell 52631
 Castle 54165
 Davis (VA) 53376
 Ehrlich 53061
 Franks 55361
 Frelinghuysen 55034
 Gilchrest 55311
Gilman 53776
Greenwood 54276
 Hobson 54324
Horn 56676
Houghton 53161
Johnson (CT) 54476
Kelly 55441
 Lazio 53335
 Leach 56576
Morella 55341
Porter 54835
Pryce 52015
 Ramstad 52871
 Roukema 54465
Shays 55541
 Thomas 52915
 Upton 53761

Leans Pro (4)

+ Foley 55792
 Isakson 54501
 LEAN+ Kuykendall 58820
 Walden 56730

Mixed (11)

Bono 55330
 + Cooksey 58490
 Dunn 57761
 Fowler 52501
 + Gibbons 56155
 + Ose 55716
 Regula 53876
 Shaw 53026
 Sweeney 55614
 Toomey 56411
 Wilson 56316

Leans Con (7)

Bereuter 54806
 Ganske 54426
 Gekas 54315
 Granger 55071
 Lewis (CA) 55861
 LEAN+ Miller (FL) 55015
 Skeen 52365

Con (171)—see page 3

Democrats—UNFPA Amendment

Pro (167)—see page 4

Leans Pro (5)

	Cramer	54801
LEAN+	Kleccka	54572
+	McNulty	55076
LEAN+	Neal	55601
+	Tanner	54714

Mixed (6)

Berry	54076
+ Crowley	53965
LEAN + Danner	57401
+ Kaptur	54146
LEAN + Moakley	58273
Obey	53365

Leans Con (8)

	Bonior	52106
LEAN+	Borski	58251
	Hall (OH)	56465
LEAN+	Kanjorski	56511
	Klink	52565
	Murtha	52065
LEAN+	Oberstar	56211
	Traficant	55261

Con (26)

Barcia	58171
Costello	55661
Doyle	52135
Goode	54711
Hall (TX)	56673
Holden	55546
John	52031
Kildee	53611
Kucinich	55871
LaFalce	53231
Lipinski	55701
Lucas (KY)	53465
Mascara	54665
McIntyre	52731
Mollohan	54172
Ortiz	57742
Peterson (MN)	52165
Phelps	55201
Rahall	53452
Roemer	53915
Shows	55865
Skelton	52876
Stenholm	56605
Stupak	54735
Taylor (MS)	55772
Weygand	52735

Republicans—UNFPA Amendment

Con (171)

Aderholt	Cannon	Ewing	Hutchinson	Metcalf	Rogers	Sununu
Archer	Chabot	Fletcher	Hyde	Mica	Rohrabacher	Talent
Armey	Chambliss	Forbes	Istook	Miller, Gary (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tancredo
Bachus	Chenoweth	Fossella	Jenkins	Moran (KS)	Royce	Tauzin
Baker	Coble	Gallegly	Johnson, S (TX)	Myrick	Ryan	Taylor (NC)
Ballenger	Coburn	Gillmor	Jones (NC)	Nethercutt	Ryun	Terry
Barr	Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Kasich	Ney	Salmon	Thornberry
Barrett	Combest	Goodling	King	Northup	Sanford	Thune
Bartlett (MD)	Cook	Goss	Kingston	Norwood	Saxton	Tiahrt
Barton	Cox	Graham	Knollenberg	Nussle	Scarborough	Walsh
Bateman	Crane	Green (WI)	LaHood	Oxley	Schaffer	Wamp
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gutknecht	Largent	Packard	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Bliley	Cunningham,	Hansen	Latham	Paul	Sessions	Watts
Blunt	Deal	Hastert	LaTourette	Pease	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Boehner	DeLay	Hastings (WA)	Lewis (KY)	Peterson (PA)	Sherwood	Weldon (FL)
Bonilla	DeMint	Hayworth	Linder	Petri	Shimkus	Weller
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart,	Hayes	LoBiondo	Pickering	Shuster	Whitfield
Bryant (TN)	Dickey	Hefley	Lucas (OK)	Pitts	Simpson	Wicker
Burr	Doolittle	Herger	Manzullo	Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Burton)	Dreier	Hill (MT)	McCollum	Portman	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Buyer	Duncan	Hilleary	McCrery	Quinn	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Callahan	Ehlers	Hoekstra	McHugh	Radanovich	Souder	
Calvert	Emerson	Hostettler	McInnis	Reynolds	Spence	
Camp	English	Hulshof	McIntosh	Riley	Stearns	
Canady	Everett	Hunter	McKeon	Rogan	Stump	

Democrats—UNFPA Amendment

Pro (167)

Abercrombie	Clay	Fattah	Kennedy	Millender-McDona	Sanchez	Vento
Ackerman	Clayton	Filner	Kilpatrick	<u>Miller</u> (CA)	<u>Sanders</u> (IND-VT)	Visclosky
<u>Allen</u>	Clement	Ford	Kind	Minge	Sandlin	<u>Waters</u>
Andrews	Clyburn	Frank	Lampson	Mink	<u>Sawyer</u>	Watt
<u>Baird</u>	Condit	Frost	<u>Lantos</u>	Moore	<u>Schakowsky</u>	<u>Waxman</u>
<u>Baldacci</u>	<u>Conyers</u>	<u>Gejdenson</u>	Larson	<u>Moran</u> (VA)	Scott	<u>Weiner</u>
Baldwin	<u>Coyne</u>	Gephardt	<u>Lee</u>	Nadler	Serrano	<u>Wexler</u>
Barrett	<u>Cummings</u>	Gonzalez	Levin	Napolitano	<u>Sherman</u>	Wise
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Gordon	<u>Lewis</u> (GA)	<u>Olver</u>	Sisisky	<u>Woolsey</u>
Bentsen	<u>Davis</u> (FL)	Green (TX)	Lofgren	Owens	<u>Slaughter</u>	<u>Wu</u>
<u>Berkley</u>	DeFazio	<u>Gutierrez</u>	<u>Lowey</u>	Pallone	Smith (WA)	<u>Wynn</u>
<u>Berman</u>	<u>DeGette</u>	Hastings (FL)	<u>Luther</u>	Pascrell	Snyder	
Bishop	<u>Delahunt</u>	Hill (IN)	<u>Maloney</u> (NY)	<u>Pastor</u>	Spratt	
Blagojevich	<u>DeLauro</u>	Hilliard	Maloney (CT)	<u>Payne</u>	Stabenow	
<u>Blumenauer</u>	Deutsch	<u>Hinchey</u>	Markey	Pelosi	Stark	
Boswell	Dicks	Hinojosa	<u>Martinez</u>	Pickett	Strickland	
Boucher	Dingell	<u>Hoeffel</u>	Matsui	Pomeroy	Tauscher	
Boyd	<u>Dixon</u>	Holt	McCarthy (NY)	<u>Price</u>	<u>Thompson</u> (MS)	
Brady	Doggett	Hooley	McCarthy (MO)	<u>Rangel</u>	<u>Thompson</u> (CA)	
<u>Brown</u> (FL)	Dooley	Hoyer	<u>McDermott</u>	Reyes	<u>Thurman</u>	
<u>Brown</u> (CA)	Edwards	<u>Inslee</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Rivers</u>	Tierney	
<u>Brown</u> (OH)	<u>Engel</u>	<u>Jackson</u> (IL)	<u>McKinney</u>	Rodriguez	<u>Towns</u>	
<u>Capps</u>	Eshoo	<u>Jackson-Lee</u>	<u>Meehan</u>	Rothman	Turner	
<u>Capuano</u>	Etheridge	<u>Jefferson</u>	Meek	<u>Roybal-Allard</u>	<u>Udall</u> (CO)	
<u>Cardin</u>	Evans	Jones (OH)	<u>Meeks</u>	Rush	Udall (NM)	
Carson	Farr	Johnson (TX)	Menendez	Sabo	Velazquez	

April 15, 1999

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

INITIALS: PLC DATE: 03/27/13
203-0436-5

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ — not for distribution

International Family Planning Policy
U.S. House of Representatives
106th Congress (Projected)

Pro (199)

Abercrombie, Neil (D-HI)	Cardin, Benjamin (D-MD)
Ackerman, Gary (D-NY)	Carson, Julia (D-IN)
Allen, Thomas (D-ME)	Castle, Michael (R-DE)
Andrews, Robert (D-NJ)	Clay, Bill (D-MO)
Baird, Brian (D-WA)*	Clayton, Eva (D-NC)
Baldacci, John (D-ME)	Clement, Bob (D-TN)
Baldwin, Tammy (D-WI)*	Clyburn, James (D-SC)
Barrett, Thomas (D-WI)	Condit, Gary (D-CA)
Bass, Charles (R-NH)	Conyers, Jr., John (D-MI)
Becerra, Xavier (D-CA)	Coyne, William (D-PA)
Bentsen, Ken (D-TX)	Cummings, Elijah (D-MD)
Berkley, Shelley (D-NV)*	Davis, Danny (D-IL)
Berman, Howard (D-CA)	Davis, Jim (D-FL)
Biggert, Judy (R-IL)*	Davis, III, Thomas (R-VA)
Bilbray, Brian (R-CA)	DeFazio, Peter (D-OR)
Bishop, Sanford (D-GA)	DeGette, Diana (D-CO)
Blagojevich, Rod (D-IL)	Delahunt, William (D-MA)
Blumenauer, Earl (D-OR)	DeLauro, Rosa (D-CT)
Boehlert, Sherwood (R-NY)	Deutsch, Peter (D-FL)
Boswell, Leonard (D-IA)	Dicks, Norman (D-WA)
Boucher, Rick (D-VA)	Dingell, John (D-MI)
Boyd, Allen (D-FL)	Dixon, Julian (D-CA)
Brady, Robert (D-PA)	Doggett, Lloyd (D-TX)
Brown, Corrine (D-FL)	Dooley, Calvin (D-CA)
Brown, Jr., George (D-CA)	Edwards, Chet (D-TX)
Brown, Sherrod (D-OH)	Ehrlich, Robert (R-MD)
Campbell, Tom (R-CA)	Engel, Eliot (D-NY)
Capps, Lois (D-CA)	Eshoo, Anna (D-CA)
Capuano, Mark (D-MA)*	Etheridge, Bobby (D-NC)

Evans, Lane (D-IL)
Farr, Sam (D-CA)
Fattah, Chaka (D-PA)
Filner, Bob (D-CA)
Ford, Jr., Harold (D-TN)
Frank, Barney (D-MA)
Franks, Bob (R-NJ)
Frelinghuysen, Rodney (R-NJ)
Frost, Martin (D-TX)
Gejdenson, Sam (D-CT)
Gephardt, Richard (D-MO)
Gilchrest, Wayne (R-MD)
Gilman, Benjamin (R-NY)
Gonzalez, Charlie (D-TX)*
Gordon, Bart (D-TN)
Green, Gene (D-TX)
Greenwood, Jim (R-PA)
Gutierrez, Luis (D-IL)
Hastings, Alcee (D-FL)
Hill, Baron (D-IN)*
Hilliard, Earl (D-AL)
Hinchey, Maurice (D-NY)
Hinojosa, Ruben (D-TX)
Hobson, David (R-OH)
Hoeffel, Joseph (D-PA)*
Holt, Rush (D-NJ)*
Hooley, Darlene (D-OR)
Horn, Steve (R-CA)
Houghton, Amo (R-NY)
Hoyer, Steny (D-MD)
Inslee, Jay (D-WA)*
Jackson, Jr., Jesse (D-IL)
Jackson-Lee, Sheila (D-TX)
Jefferson, William (D-LA)
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs (D-OH)*
Johnson, Eddie Bernice (D-TX)

Johnson, Nancy (R-CT)
Kelly, Sue (R-NY)
Kennedy, Patrick (D-RI)
Kilpatrick, Carolyn (D-MI)
Kind, Ron (D-WI)
Kolbe, Jim (R-AZ)
Kuykendall, Steven (R-CA)*
Lampson, Nick (D-TX)
Lantos, Tom (D-CA)
Larson, John (D-CT)*
Lazio, Rick (R-NY)
Leach, Jim (R-IA)
Lee, Barbara (D-CA)
Levin, Sander (D-MI)
Lewis, John (D-GA)
Lofgren, Zoe (D-CA)
Lowey, Nita (D-NY)
Luther, Bill (D-MN)
Maloney, Carolyn (D-NY)
Maloney, James (D-CT)
Markey, Edward (D-MA)
Martinez, Matthew (D-CA)
Matsui, Robert (D-CA)
McCarthy, Carolyn (D-NY)
McCarthy, Karen (D-MO)
McDermott, Jim (D-WA)
McGovern, James (D-MA)
McKinney, Cynthia (D-GA)
Meehan, Martin (D-MA)
Meek, Carrie (D-FL)
Meeks, Gregory (D-NY)
Menendez, Robert (D-NJ)
Millender-McDonald, J. (D-CA)
Miller, George (D-CA)
Minge, David (D-MN)
Mink, Patsy (D-HI)

Moore, Dennis (D-KS)*
 Moran, Jr., James (D-VA)
 Morella, Constance (R-MD)
 Nadler, Jerrold (D-NY)
 Napolitano, Grace (D-CA)*
 Obey, David (D-WI)
 Olver, John (D-MA)
 Owens, Major (D-NY)
 Pallone, Jr., Frank (D-NJ)
 Pascrell, William (D-NJ)
 Pastor, Ed (D-AZ)
 Payne, Donald (D-NJ)
 Pelosi, Nancy (D-CA)
 Pickett, Owen (D-VA)
 Pomeroy, Earl (D-ND)
 Porter, John (R-IL)
 Price, David (D-NC)
 Pryce, Deborah (R-OH)
 Ramstad, Jim (R-MN)
 Rangel, Charles (D-NY)
 Reyes, Silvestre (D-TX)
 Rivers, Lynn (D-MI)
 Rodriguez, Ciro (D-TX)
 Rothman, Steve (D-NJ)
 Roukema, Marge (R-NJ)
 Roybal-Allard, Lucille (D-CA)
 Rush, Bobby (D-IL)
 Sabo, Martin (D-MN)
 Sanchez, Loretta (D-CA)
 Sanders, Bernard (IND-VT)
 Sandlin, Max (D-TX)
 Sawyer, Tom (D-OH)
 Schakowsky, Jan (D-IL)*
 Scott, Bobby (D-VA)
 Serrano, Jose (D-NY)

Shays, Christopher (R-CT)
 Sherman, Brad (D-CA)
 Sisisky, Norman (D-VA)
 Slaughter, Louise (D-NY)
 Smith, Adam (D-WA)
 Snyder, Victor (D-AR)
 Spratt, Jr., John (D-SC)
 Stabenow, Debbie (D-MI)
 Stark, Pete (D-CA)
 Strickland, Ted (D-OH)
 Tauscher, Ellen (D-CA)
 Thomas, Bill (R-CA)
 Thompson, Bennie (D-MS)
 Thompson, Mike (D-CA)*
 Thurman, Karen (D-FL)
 Tierney, John (D-MA)
 Towns, Edolphus (D-NY)
 Turner, Jim (D-TX)
 Udall, Mark (D-CO)*
 Udall, Tom (D-NM)*
 Upton, Fred (R-MI)
 Velazquez, Nydia (D-NY)
 Vento, Bruce (D-MN)
 Visclosky, Peter (D-IN)
 Walden, Greg (R-OR)*
 Waters, Maxine (D-CA)
 Watt, Melvin (D-NC)
 Waxman, Henry (D-CA)
 Weiner, Anthony (D-NY)*
 Wexler, Robert (D-FL)
 Wise, Jr., Bob (D-WV)
 Woolsey, Lynn (D-CA)
 Wu, David (D-OR)*
 Wynn, Albert (D-MD)

* = New Members

Leans Pro (6)

Cramer, Robert (Bud) (D-AL)
Isakson, Johnny (R-GA)*
Kleczka, Gerald (D-WI)
McNulty, Michael (D-NY)
Neal, Richard (D-MA)
Tanner, John (D-TN)

Mixed (15)

Berry, Marion (D-AR)
Bono, Mary (R-CA)
Danner, Pat (D-MO)
Dunn, Jennifer (R-WA)
Foley, Mark (R-FL)
Fowler, Tillie (R-FL)
Gibbons, Jim (R-NV)
Kaptur, Marcy (D-OH)
Moakley, Joe (D-MA)
Ose, Doug (R-CA)*
Regula, Ralph (R-OH)
Shaw, Clay (R-FA)
Sweeney, John (R-NY)*
Toomey, Pat (R-PA)*
Wilson, Heather (R-NM)

Leans Con (15)

Bereuter, Douglas (R-NE)
Bonior, David (D-MI)
Borski, Robert (D-PA)
Cooksey, John (R-LA)
Crowley, Joseph (D-NY)*
Ganske, Greg (R-IA)
Gekas, George (R-PA)
Hall, Tony (D-OH)

Kanjorski, Paul (D-PA)
Klink, Ron (D-PA)
Lewis, Jerry (R-CA)
Miller, Dan (R-FL)
Murtha, John (D-PA)
Skeen, Joe (R-NM)
Traficant, Jr., James (D-OH)

Vacancy (1)

Con (199)

Aderholt, Robert (R-AL)	Cook, Merrill (R-UT)
Archer, Bill (R-TX)	Costello, Jerry (D-IL)
Armey, Richard (R-TX)	Cox, Christopher (R-CA)
Bachus, Spencer (R-AL)	Crane, Philip (R-IL)
Baker, Richard (R-LA)	Cubin, Barbara (R-WY)
Ballenger, Cass (R-NC)	Cunningham, "Duke" (R-CA)
Barcia, James (D-MI)	Deal, Nathan (R-GA)
Barr, Bob (R-GA)	DeLay, Tom (R-TX)
Barrett, Bill (R-NE)	DeMint, Jim (R-SC)*
Bartlett, Roscoe (R-MD)	Diaz-Balart, Lincoln (R-FL)
Barton, Joe (R-TX)	Dickey, Jay (R-AR)
Bateman, Herbert (R-VA)	Doolittle, John (R-CA)
Bilirakis, Michael (R-FL)	Doyle, Michael (D-PA)
Bliley, Jr., Thomas (R-VA)	Dreier, David (R-CA)
Blunt, Roy (R-MO)	Duncan, Jr., John (R-TN)
Boehner, John (R-OH)	Ehlers, Vernon (R-MI)
Bonilla, Henry (R-TX)	Emerson, Jo Ann (R-MO)
Brady, Kevin (R-TX)	English, Phil (R-PA)
Bryant, Ed (R-TN)	Everett, Terry (R-AL)
Burr, Richard (R-NC)	Ewing, Thomas (R-IL)
Burton, Dan (R-IN)	Fletcher, Ernest (R-KY)*
Buyer, Stephen (R-IN)	Forbes, Michael (R-NY)
Callahan, Sonny (R-AL)	Fossella, Vito (R-NY)
Calvert, Ken (R-CA)	Gallegly, Elton (R-CA)
Camp, Dave (R-MI)	Gillmor, Paul (R-OH)
Canady, Charles (R-FL)	Goode, Jr., Virgil (D-VA)
Cannon, Christopher (R-UT)	Goodlatte, Bob (R-VA)
Chabot, Steve (R-OH)	Goodling, William (R-PA)
Chambliss, Saxby (R-GA)	Goss, Porter (R-FL)
Chenoweth, Helen (R-ID)	Graham, Lindsey (R-SC)
Coble, Howard (R-NC)	Granger, Kay (R-TX)
Coburn, Tom (R-OK)	Green, Mark (R-WI)*
Collins, Mac (R-GA)	Gutknecht, Gil (R-MN)
Combest, Larry (R-TX)	Hall, Ralph (D-TX)

Hansen, James (R-UT)
Hastert, J. Dennis (R-IL)
Hastings, Richard (R-WA)
Hayworth, J.D. (R-AZ)
Hayes, Robin (R-NC)*
Hefley, Joel (R-CO)
Herger, Wally (R-CO)
Hill, Rick (R-MT)
Hilleary, Van (R-TN)
Hoekstra, Peter (R-MI)
Holden, Tim (R-PA)
Hostettler, John (R-IN)
Hulshof, Kenny (R-MO)
Hunter, Duncan (R-CA)
Hutchinson, Asa (R-AR)
Hyde, Henry (R-IL)
Istook, Jr., Ernest (R-OK)
Jenkins, Bill (R-TN)
John, Chris (D-LA)
Johnson, Sam (R-TX)
Jones, Jr., Walter (R-NC)
Kasich, John (R-OH)
Kildee, Dale (D-MI)
King, Peter (R-NY)
Kingston, Jack (R-GA)
Knollenberg, Joe (R-MI)
Kucinich, Dennis (D-OH)
LaFalce, John (D-NY)
LaHood, Ray (R-IL)
Largent, Steve (R-OK)
Latham, Tom (R-IA)
LaTourette, Steven (R-OH)
Lewis, Ron (R-KY)
Linder, John (R-GA)
Lipinski, William (D-IL)
LoBiondo, Frank (R-NJ)

Lucas, Frank (R-OK)
Lucas, Ken (D-KY)*
Manzullo, Donald (R-IL)
Mascara, Frank (D-PA)
McCollum, Bill (R-FL)
McCrery, Jim (R-LA)
McHugh, John (R-NY)
McInnis, Scott (R-CO)
McIntosh, David (R-IN)
McIntyre, Mike (D-NC)
McKeon, Howard (R-CA)
Metcalf, Jack (R-WA)
Mica, John (R-FL)
Miller, Gary (R-CA)*
Mollohan, Alan (D-WV)
Moran, Jerry (R-KS)
Myrick, Sue (R-NC)
Nethercutt, George (R-WA)
Ney, Robert (R-OH)
Northup, Anne (R-KY)
Norwood, Charlie (R-GA)
Nussle, Jim (R-IA)
Oberstar, James (D-MN)
Ortiz, Solomon (D-TX)
Oxley, Michael (R-OH)
Packard, Ron (R-CA)
Paul, Ron (R-TX)
Pease, Ed (R-IN)
Peterson, Collin (D-MN)
Peterson, John (R-PA)
Petri, Thomas (R-WI)
Phelps, David (D-IL)*
Pickering, Charles (R-MS)
Pitts, Joe (R-PA)
Pombo, Richard (R-CA)
Portman, Rob (R-OH)

Quinn, Jack (R-NY)
 Radanovich, George (R-CA)
 Rahall, Nick (D-WV)
 Reynolds, Tom (R-NY)*
 Riley, Bob (R-AL)
 Roemer, Tim (D-IN)
 Rogan, James (R-CA)
 Rogers, Harold (R-KY)
 Rohrabacher, Dana (R-CA)
 Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana (R-FK)
 Royce, Ed (R-CA)
 Ryan, Paul (R-WA)*
 Ryun, Jim (R-KS)
 Salmon, Matt (R-AZ)
 Sanford, Marshall (R-SC)
 Saxton, Jim (R-NJ)
 Scarborough, Joe (R-FL)
 Schaffer, Robert (R-CO)
 Sensenbrenner, F. James (R-WI)
 Sessions, Pete (R-TX)
 Shadegg, John (R-AZ)
 Sherwood, Don (R-PA)*
 Shimkus, John (R-IL)
 Shows, Ronnie (D-MS)*
 Shuster, Bud (R-PA)
 Skelton, Ike (D-MO)
 Simpson, Mike (R-ID)*
 Smith, Christopher (R-NJ)
 Smith, Lamar (R-TX)
 Smith, Nick (R-MI)

Souder, Mark (R-IN)
 Spence, Floyd (R-SC)
 Stearns, Cliff (R-FL)
 Stenholm, Charles (R-TX)
 Stump, Bob (R-AZ)
 Stupak, Bart (D-MI)
 Sununu, John (R-NH)
 Talent, James (R-MO)
 Tancredo, Tom (R-CO)*
 Tauzin, Billy (R-LA)
 Taylor, Charles (R-NC)
 Taylor, Gene (D-MS)
 Terry, Lee (R-NE)*
 Thornberry, Mac (R-TX)
 Thune, John (R-SD)
 Tiahrt, Todd (R-KS)
 Walsh, James (R-NY)
 Wamp, Zach (R-TN)
 Watkins, Wes (R-OK)
 Watts, Jr., J.C. (R-OK)
 Weldon, Curt (R-PA)
 Weldon, Dave (R-FL)
 Weller, Jerry (R-IL)
 Weygand, Robert (D-RI)
 Whitfield, Ed (R-KY)
 Wicker, Roger (R-MS)
 Wolf, Frank (R-VA)
 Young, C.W. Bill (R-FL)
 Young, Don (R-AK)

* = New Members

sheet

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD RESTORE FUNDING FOR UNFPA

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) provides international leadership on population issues and is a key source of financial assistance for family planning programs in poor countries. The United States played an important role in UNFPA's creation, but has been inconsistent in its financial support in recent years and eliminated its contribution to the Fund for 1999.

Increasing funding for UNFPA programs, including restoring the U.S. contribution, is crucial to improving the health of women and their families and to addressing rapid population growth.

A GLOBAL LEADER

■ **The United Nations Population Fund is the principal United Nations (UN) organization in the population field.** The Fund is the second largest source of grant assistance to population programs in developing countries. UNFPA has helped many countries to adopt national population policies and initiate and strengthen their family planning programs. It has also become an important advocate for improving the status of women.

■ **UNFPA provides global leadership on population issues.** As a UN organization, the Fund is a politically neutral source of funds and advice. The UN has a worldwide presence and is a stable source of long-term assistance to developing countries. In contrast, donor country aid programs often respond to short-term political interests. UNFPA organized the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development and is a natural lead agency to advance the goals agreed on at the conference.

■ **UNFPA is an important channel for donor country contributions to population programs.** UNFPA funds come from voluntary contributions made by countries in addition to their assessed dues. A total of 88 countries, including many in the developing world, contributed to UNFPA in 1997. However, a

few wealthy countries provide most of UNFPA's funds. Some donor countries, lacking field offices or expertise to manage their own programs, channel almost all their population assistance through UNFPA. Japan, Denmark, and the Netherlands are UNFPA's largest donors. In 1995, the United States was the fourth largest contributor, providing \$35 million of UNFPA's total income of \$312 million. But the U.S. contribution slipped to \$20 million in 1998, and family planning opponents in the Congress eliminated all U.S. funding for UNFPA for 1999.

BROAD SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE

■ **UNFPA provides substantial financial assistance.** The Fund accounts for a quarter of all grant assistance to population programs worldwide. Over the past 29 years, it has provided more than \$4 billion for projects in 171 countries. In 1997, the Fund provided \$264 million for country-level population projects, a decline from the high of \$274 million in 1995.

■ **UNFPA provides population assistance to about 150 countries, more than any other donor agency.** In comparison, only about 70 countries currently receive U.S. population assistance. UNFPA has played a key role in countries where few other donors

provide population assistance—for example, Iran, Vietnam, and a number of small African countries. According to a 1993 analysis, UNFPA funding accounted for over two-thirds of total population assistance in roughly one-quarter of the countries it assisted that year.

SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING

■ **UNFPA is committed to freedom of individual choice in family planning.** UNFPA's assistance is grounded in the principle, affirmed at international conferences, that "all couples and individuals have the right to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, and to have access to the information, education and means to do so." The Fund opposes coercion in any form. UNFPA does not support abortion services, but recognizes unsafe abortion as a major health problem. It seeks to reduce abortions and related deaths by improving access to contraception and to treatment for complications of unsafe abortion.

■ **Two-thirds of UNFPA assistance supports reproductive health programs including family planning services.** The Fund's priorities include preventing teen pregnancy and HIV/AIDS, promoting safe pregnancy and delivery, and expanding access to

reproductive health care for the poor and other hard to reach groups. In 1997, the Fund purchased contraceptives valued at nearly \$50 million—including 190 million condoms for HIV/AIDS prevention and family planning programs. The Fund also supports data collection and research to encourage appropriate population and development policies; activities to improve the status of women; and advocacy to galvanize political and financial backing for reproductive health activities and to spotlight the importance of population factors to sustainable development.

AN EFFICIENT AND INNOVATIVE AGENCY

■ **UNFPA is lean, dynamic and field-oriented.** The Fund is widely considered to be better managed than most other UN agencies. It is relatively small, with a total staff of 919 in 1997. Although UNFPA's headquarters are in New York, three-quarters of its staff work in 65 overseas field offices, one-half of them in Africa. In recent years, UNFPA has taken a number of steps to improve its effectiveness and impact.

The Fund also recognizes the valuable work carried out by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs); in 1997, about 15 percent of UNFPA funds went to projects carried out by NGOs.

U.S. SUPPORT INCONSISTENT

■ **The United States helped establish the Fund in 1969 and has played a leadership role in UNFPA ever since.** With its substantial expertise in the population field, the United States has been an active participant on the Executive Board made up of 36 UN member states, which provides oversight for UNFPA. Until 1985, the United States was the largest donor, providing nearly one-third of total annual funding for UNFPA.

■ **In recent years, however, the United States has been an unreliable source of financial support for UNFPA.** Between 1986 and 1992, the U.S. Administration withheld all con-

tributions to UNFPA approved by the Congress in response to attacks on UNFPA by abortion opponents. These attacks were prompted by reports of human rights abuses in China, where UNFPA has provided assistance, even though an official U.S. review concluded that UNFPA did not fund abortion or support coercive family planning practices. In 1993, President Clinton restored U.S. funding to UNFPA on the condition that no U.S. funds be used in China, but beginning in 1996, the U.S. contribution declined dramatically. For 1999, Congress rejected the \$25 million contribution proposed by the Clinton Administration, and prohibited any contribution to UNFPA. The ban apparently reflects concern about UNFPA's new program in China, initiated in early 1998.

■ **Inconsistent U.S. funding has undermined UNFPA's program and diminished U.S. leadership and influence.** The uncertainty surrounding the annual U.S. contribution makes long-term planning difficult for UNFPA and the countries it assists. The British government has pledged to increase its contribution to UNFPA to help compensate for the loss of U.S. funds and has urged other donor countries to follow suit. But a significant U.S. contribution remains essential if UNFPA is to meet the growing need for family planning and reproductive health care in developing countries, especially as the U.S. foreign aid program provides population assistance to a decreasing number of countries. Efforts by U.S. family planning opponents to link human rights abuses in China to U.S. funding for UNFPA penalize all other poor countries in need of UNFPA's assistance.

UNFPA AND CHINA

■ **There are important reasons why UNFPA should work in China.** Roughly 20 percent of the world's women live in China. UNFPA is a source of contact with international experts who can recommend al-

ternative approaches to China's compulsory family planning program. In early 1998, the Fund's Executive Board approved a new \$20 million, four-year program to be implemented in 32 counties which aims to promote voluntary use of family planning and to allow couples to freely choose the size of their families. *The emphasis on voluntarism represents an important breakthrough in the context of China's current program.*

■ **UNFPA's relatively modest assistance focuses on improving family planning services in China and is in no way connected to human rights abuses.** In the past, the Fund helped upgrade the quality of contraceptive supplies, reducing contraceptive failures and resulting abortions; it also strengthened other maternal and child health services. The new program, in 32 counties, will replace compulsory use of family planning and birth quotas with good counseling and informed consent, a greater range of contraceptive method choices, and higher quality services. The program also supports activities to strengthen prenatal care and safe delivery, and to enhance the status of women. Many members of UNFPA's Executive Board see the UNFPA program as a positive force with the potential to improve China's national family planning policy.

THE U.S. MUST SUPPORT UNFPA

■ **The U.S. needs to restore funding for UNFPA.** The world looks to the United States for leadership in addressing global problems. Opinion polls show substantial support for the UN among Americans, especially in improving health, stabilizing population and conserving the environment. UNFPA remains the only intergovernmental institution with a mandate to address the unmet reproductive health needs of men and women worldwide as well as the crucial challenge of population growth. The United States must join other donor nations in supporting these roles.



WHY THE GLOBAL GAG RULE UNDERMINES U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND HARMS WOMEN'S HEALTH

Since 1995, family planning opponents in Congress have sought to enact new abortion-related restrictions on U.S. population assistance known as the "Global Gag Rule." These restrictions, similar to the Mexico City policy in effect from 1984 to 1993, would be detrimental to U.S. foreign policy objectives, to family planning programs in developing countries and to women's health.

THE GLOBAL GAG RULE

✱ The Global Gag Rule aims to deny foreign organizations to receive abortion-related activities as a condition of receiving U.S. family planning funds. Foreign aid legislation passed by the U.S. House of Representatives since 1995 has sought to deny U.S. family planning assistance to private organizations overseas if they use other, non-U.S. funds to provide legal abortion services or to participate in policy debates over abortion in their own countries. Family planning supporters call this the "Global Gag Rule" since it seeks to restrict free speech as well as the provision of abortion services. However, because of Senate and administration opposition, the Gag Rule has not become law.

✱ The Global Gag Rule is similar to an earlier called Mexico City policy. The policy was named for the site of the 1984 international population conference where the United States announced it would end support to private family planning programs overseas if these programs had any involvement in abortion, even with non-U.S. funds. The restrictions were never enacted into law but were enforced as executive branch policy from 1984 until President Clinton repealed them in early 1993.

NO U.S. FUNDS SUPPORT ABORTION

✱ Current law already bars U.S. family planning funds from paying for abortions overseas. Since 1973, the Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act has prohibited the use of U.S. funds for abortion services. Biomedical research and lobbying on abortion were banned in 1981. The U.S. foreign aid program strictly enforces these prohibitions. Even abortion opponents agree that there is no direct funding of abortion. However, proponents of the Global Gag Rule argue that providing funds for family planning activities to organizations also involved in abortion frees up their other funds for abortion-related activities. Funds for family planning, however, are no more or less fungible than any other foreign aid funds.

CONFLICT WITH U.S. FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

✱ The Global Gag Rule would undermine key U.S. foreign aid objectives. These objectives include protecting human health, especially by improving access to family planning and reproductive health care, and stabilizing world population size. Under the proposed Gag Rule, comprehensive maternal and child health programs could be ineligible for U.S. family

planning funds if they cooperate with health facilities or practitioners involved in abortion. In addition, Gag Rule proponents have linked approval of the measure to U.S. funding for key international organizations, undermining U.S. global leadership, security and economic interests.

✱ U.S. policy restrictions also undermine the effectiveness of U.S. population assistance. Many developing country leaders interpreted the Mexico City policy as a sign of U.S. disengagement from its long-standing commitment to international population assistance. Moreover, in countries such as India where abortion is legal, the Mexico City policy made it difficult for U.S. organizations receiving foreign aid funds to work with the most innovative, effective and committed private family planning organizations. Such groups often saw the quality of care and needs of their clients subordinated to these U.S. policy restrictions. The Global Gag Rule would likely create a similar situation in over 40 developing countries where abortion is legal in circumstances broader than the exceptions approved by the House.

VIOLATION OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

✱ The Gag Rule restricts the freedoms of speech and association of foreign organizations. Recently

proposed restrictions on advocacy are much broader than the Mexico City policy, and would prohibit participation in meetings or dissemination of information on "alleged defects in abortion laws." According to Gag Rule proponents, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) would violate the restrictions if they spoke to government health officials about the adverse health consequences for women of unsafe abortion or participated in conferences or workshops which include discussion of such issues. In the United States, such restrictions on public policy debates would be unconstitutional. They also conflict with U.S. foreign policy goals of promoting democratic values overseas.

■ **The restrictions would discriminate against private organizations, contrary to U.S. efforts to promote their role in civil society.**

Like the Mexico City policy, the Global Gag Rule would not apply to governments receiving U.S. foreign aid, but it would prohibit foreign private organizations from engaging in abortion-related activities, even if financed with non-U.S. funds and in a manner consistent with local laws, policies and standards of medical practice. Again, this runs counter to official U.S. policy of encouraging broad participation in the political process.

HARM TO WOMEN'S HEALTH

■ **Cutbacks in family planning services would likely contribute to an increase in abortions.** Today, the Gag Rule could have its greatest impact on women in countries such as Russia, where U.S. foreign aid has contributed to a significant increase in the use of modern contraceptives and a concurrent decline in abortions. Many health facilities could be ineligible for U.S. family planning assistance because they provide both fledgling family planning services and long-standing abortion services. Research from Russia and several other countries shows that higher levels of contraceptive use (reflecting greater access to family plan-

ning services) are associated with lower reliance on abortion. With less money, organizations would have to scale back family planning services—denying some women access to contraceptive services and, ironically, leading to more unwanted pregnancies and abortions.

■ **At the clinic level, such policy restrictions interfere with appropriate medical care.** The Mexico City policy prohibited NGO family planning workers from providing information on abortion to women found to be pregnant during initial screening for contraception or in cases of contraceptive failure, even where abortion was legal. Although sponsors of the new Gag Rule are not seeking a ban on counseling or referral for abortion, U.S. restrictions can have a chilling effect beyond the scope of the regulations themselves. Under the Mexico City policy, for example, some family planning groups were reluctant to treat clients following septic or spontaneous abortions, fearing that any association with abortion made them vulnerable to withdrawal of U.S. funds. The policy also contributed to a rigid separation of abortion and contraceptive services, limiting access to contraceptive services for women following abortion and impeding efforts to prevent repeat abortions.

■ **The Mexico City policy resulted in the withdrawal of U.S. funds from two major family planning networks.** The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) and Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) refused as a matter of principle to impose the U.S. restrictions on their partners in developing countries. The U.S. government cut off funds to both organizations, resulting in a major cut-back in family planning services. Fearing the loss of all U.S. funds for family planning programs serving millions of men and women, other family planning organizations reluctantly agreed to accept the Mexico City policy.

■ **IPPF and some other groups would likely face another cut-off in funds if the Global Gag Rule were to become law.** In 1993, USAID

resumed support for IPPF, the largest network of private family planning organizations in the world. Today, IPPF spends less than one-half of one percent of its central budget—and no U.S. funds—on abortion-related activities. But as a federation of national family planning associations, IPPF cannot impose U.S. policies on 188 affiliates in countries with very different abortion policies.

SILENCE ON UNSAFE ABORTION

■ **The Global Gag Rule would suppress public debate and the exchange of information about unsafe abortion.** Regardless of whether abortion is legal or not, it is widely practiced around the world. Abortions performed under unsafe conditions remain a major public health problem; about 75,000 women die each year from septic and incomplete abortion, many of them leaving behind young children. Tens of thousands more suffer serious illness or injury. While the Mexico City policy was in effect, there was no evidence of any reduction in the number of abortions, the stated purpose of the policy. However, some organizations discontinued research on abortion as a public health problem, including the collection of basic information on its incidence. In addition, several medical and demographic journals receiving U.S. funds excluded all discussion of abortion.

■ **Compliance with a Global Gag Rule would undermine recent efforts to address unsafe abortion.** The Mexico City policy created a climate where many governments, NGOs and individuals were reluctant to address the problem of unsafe abortion. Subsequently, the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development helped stimulate more open debate on the consequences of restrictive abortion laws, the burden of which generally fall on poor rural women. The restrictions on advocacy in the Global Gag Rule would almost certainly undermine ongoing efforts in a number of countries to review abortion laws and policies with the goal of preventing deaths from unsafe abortions.

