

are part of experimentation with Norplant. We have heard accounts of women in Turkey who were told by volunteers that "family planning" is more important than husbands, tradition, culture or God, and that sterilization is better than children.

Surely even those who advocate dollars for responsible population control policy would be alarmed at this information. Surely we should not force our constituents to contribute to these programs that undermine the cultures of our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply conclude by expressing once again that we need to reevaluate our priorities, our financial situation, and most importantly, our constitutional obligations, and support this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which will eliminate USAID funding for international family planning.

The need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile. Last February, both the House and the Senate showed their commitment to the USAID International Family Planning Program by voting for the early release of the funds for this program.

Eliminating family planning will deeply hurt millions of women and children.

Nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth; 99 percent of these women live in developing countries. In many countries, women are the primary caregivers of children and a mother's survival is crucial to the survival and well-being of her children. Our international family planning programs are working to reduce maternal deaths and illness due to childbirth.

The ability to control the timing and spacing of childbearing helps mothers, infants, and children thrive. Infants born less than 2 years after a sibling are more likely to have low birth weight, making them more vulnerable to illness and death. One in five infant deaths alone could be averted by the better spacing of births.

In addition, the health of the mother is also put at risk when couples cannot control the number and timing of births. For example, very young women and women who have births very close together are at greater risk for postpartum hemorrhage, a leading cause of maternal death. And for every woman who dies during childbirth, many more face injuries and infections, leaving them permanently disabled or infertile.

This amendment will prevent us from eliminating these tragedies. Simply put—this amendment will end our family planning programs. Period.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We cannot let them eliminate international family planning—there is too much at stake. I urge you to continue this vital investment in the reproductive health and safety of women and children.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania:

Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

Sec. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE" may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Fox-Miller amendment, which would restrict funding of the CAMPFIRE program used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 8 years, the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, otherwise known as CAMPFIRE, has implemented many valuable programs which have helped improve the quality of life for the people of Zimbabwe. Our amendment would do nothing to interfere with these beneficial programs.

Unfortunately, too much of the funding, however, from the U.S. Agency for International Development is used to promote the killing of the African elephant, which remains on the endangered species list.

The organizations to my left, over 200, have supported our amendment, as well as over 20 newspapers from around the country.

The CAMPFIRE program, instead of becoming more sustainable, has become increasingly dependent on foreign subsidies from USAID other international sources. In 1989, USAID spent an average of \$1.3 million per year over 6 years on CAMPFIRE, whereas in 1995, USAID pledged to spend an average of \$5.12 million per year over 4 years on the program.

Additionally, CAMPFIRE relied on funds from countries such as Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Great Britain, the European Commission, Sweden, and Canada, which in 1995 totaled in excess of \$1.4 million and which has no ban on its use for the promotion of trophy hunts.

We are very concerned that U.S. taxpayer dollars have been used by CAMPFIRE implementing agencies to lobby the U.S. Congress in an ongoing effort to advocate the ivory trade and the weakening of the foreign species provision of the Endangered Species Act.

We believe it is inappropriate for the U.S. Government to supply funds to foreign entities which then use those funds to launch special-interest lobbying efforts to Members of Congress.

□ 1415

American taxpayers have footed the bill for these agencies to open and maintain offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg in support of these lobbying efforts.

American tax dollars were used to help CAMPFIRE agencies overturn the ivory trade ban, which undermined the U.S. negotiating position at the June 1997 Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Since 1989, the United States has officially opposed the resumption of international trade in any elephant parts, including ivory. At the same CITES convention, the elephant was downlisted from appendix I to appendix II.

The American position has been so resolute because the devastation of the elephant during the 1980's was so severe. There were 70,000 to 100,000 elephants slaughtered a year by poachers feeding the international demand for ivory. The continent-wide population dropped from 1.3 million to 60,000 in just a decade's time.

Elephants are still in peril throughout much of their range, and the resumption of the ivory trade is a grave threat. The Fox-Miller amendment is pro-CAMPFIRE, maintaining existing funding levels and allowing USAID to invest in a wider range of revenue-generating activities that have thus far received insufficient attention. USAID has provided funds for CAMPFIRE implementing organizations for more than 9 years. More than \$25 million American tax dollars have been used to a very significant degree to promote trophy hunting and the international trade in ivory.

Our amendment places a restriction on the use of taxpayer funds for the 10th and final year of funding. It is past time that a greater share of USAID funds be used to promote other revenue-generating activities such as ecologically-sensitive wildlife tourism.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for offering this amendment. I think this is an important amendment. I rise in strong support of this legislation to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds to promote or support the African elephant ivory trade or trophy hunting.

Contrary to what Members may have heard, this amendment does not prohibit and will not prohibit trophy hunting within the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, known as the CAMPFIRE Program. Nor is the Fox-Miller amendment in any way inconsistent with the recent decision of the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora to permit the limited resumption of the ivory trade.

The issue here is whether or not United States tax dollars should be used by organizations and agencies implementing the CAMPFIRE program in