

overfly the United Kingdom to European continental airports, an open-skies

agreement with Germany that furthers the exodus of United States flights to the continent would dramatically make this point. If Britain does not want our business, clearly there are other nations who do.

Mr. President, may I proceed for 2 more minutes on the same subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

No objection is heard. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, to summarize what I have said, as a chairman of the Commerce Committee and a member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I am very eager to see us move forward on efforts to liberalize our bilateral aviation agreement with the United Kingdom. I am very concerned about the problem of access to Heathrow and resulting limitations on the ability of our carriers to serve markets beyond the United Kingdom. Also, I am disturbed by British restrictions on the beyond rights of our cargo carriers. Similarly, I am also concerned about attempts by the Government of Japan to prevent our carriers from fully participating in the booming Asia-Pacific market beyond Tokyo.

Very frankly, what these countries try to do is they have a system to block out U.S. passenger and cargo carriers as well as to prevent our carriers from serving beyond markets. I believe we should put the emphasis on jumping over Heathrow if the British are unwilling to cooperate by opening their skies to United States carriers. I have urged our Secretary of Transportation, Secretary Peña, who I think does a good job in international aviation negotiations, to treat international aviation as a trade issue and to focus on maximizing economic benefits for our country. I understand this is very difficult for Secretary Peña to do since each time he attempts to follow this course, a group of Senators and Representatives who represent a certain airline criticize what he is doing. We have to support our Secretary of Transportation when he is trying to negotiate these difficult agreements. We need to put the interests of the U.S. economy first.

The situation with the British is very frustrating and unacceptable. Britain is dragging its feet on liberalizing our air service agreement. They are stalling. I think we should make it very clear to the British if they continue to severely restrict opportunities for our carriers to serve the United Kingdom and points beyond, United States passenger and cargo carriers will turn to Germany and Amsterdam and other points in Europe. I would hope that continued progress in liberalizing our aviation relations with countries in continental Europe, and the continued exodus of United States carriers to capitalize on these opportunities, will drive home this point. Simply put, our carriers are not being treated fairly by

the British. Unfortunately, the same is true in Japan where the Government of Japan is trying to prevent our carriers from fully participating in the rapidly expanding Asia-Pacific market.

I hope our Secretary of Transportation stands firm with the British and the Japanese. I support him, and I urge the Members of this body to do so. He is doing a good job in international aviation matters under difficult circumstances.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to continue as in morning business, not in reference to the pending business, but another matter, with the understanding that, if there is someone seeking recognition not under the same standard, then we return to a quorum call.

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

TRIBUTE TO YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my wife and I were in California visiting my youngest son and his wife this past weekend. After what had been a very pleasant day out hiking and walking about, we came back to their home, and there were a series of messages for me from the White House and my chief of staff. I called back and heard the terrible news about Yitzhak Rabin. I was also asked if it would be possible to make the connection back to Washington in time to accompany the President and the others to Israel.

Mr. President, like so many millions of people, I turned to the radio and the television in disbelief. I hoped, even though the first news was so discouraging, that somehow he had survived the assassin's bullet. It seemed inconceivable that an old soldier who had survived so much, who had risked his life so many times, could be struck down this way, following a rally for peace.

Those unable to attend the ceremony in Jerusalem watched it and wept. For all the reasons said so eloquently by so many people—and I think of our own President, President Clinton, Jordan's King Hussein, the man who had a close personal relationship, one based on trust and respect, with Prime Minister Rabin, and Egypt's President Mubarak, and perhaps most of all Prime Minister Rabin's granddaughter Noa. We listened to them and know we will not forget Yitzhak Rabin.

Prime Minister Rabin was a man of great courage, of great vision, of great warmth, and, above all, great love for his country. In fact, for me it is almost impossible to think of Israel without thinking of him. My heart's hopes go out, not only to his family, but to Shimon Peres, who now takes on the awesome duties of Prime Minister at such a difficult time. To him I offer my support with the deep respect he knows I feel for him.

In remembering Prime Minister Rabin, it was his undying love for

Israel, his absolute commitment to Israel's survival, that enabled him to change course, to choose the path of peace in his final years. It was a choice and a challenge for all of us, but especially the people of the Middle East. It was a choice that was embraced by a majority of Israelis and Palestinians. It was spurned only by those too blinded by hate to see the historic opportunity that Yitzhak Rabin had seized.

Like so many others in the Senate, I was fortunate to know Yitzhak Rabin, for nearly a generation. I am going to miss him very, very much. I will miss that great and wonderful voice, and his strength and his wisdom which you could feel just standing next to him.

I had the privilege to accompany President Clinton to Aqabah last October, a year ago, for the signing of the Israeli-Jordanian peace agreement. I remember standing there in 110 degree heat, the wind blowing across the desert, as I listened to those two soldiers, Yitzhak Rabin and King Hussein, men who had fought against each other but who now stood with voices filled with emotion speaking of the need for peace.

I knew from my private conversations both with Prime Minister Rabin and with King Hussein that these were men who could rely totally and utterly on each other's words, on each other's commitment, on each other's integrity and on each other's ability for leadership. And when the ceremony ended and the grandchildren of those who had fallen in the war, Jordanians and Israelis, came and presented flowers to the leaders, you knew that it was the leadership of Yitzhak Rabin and those who joined with him made that moment possible.

Israel and the world have suffered a terrible and irreplaceable loss. We all remember the immeasurable loss after the assassination of President John Kennedy. I was not old enough to vote for President Kennedy. I was a student here in Washington when he died. And like everybody else who was old enough to know that day, I remember precisely where I was, exactly what I was doing, and the emotions I had at the time. And like so many other Americans, I wondered how we might go on.

I know that there are those same feelings in the minds of people in Israel today. But I do not fear for Israel because we can find hope in the outpouring of love and respect for Yitzhak Rabin's memory by Jews, by Arabs, by people of all faiths around the world, because more than anything, it was Yitzhak Rabin's commitment to peace that inspired that outpouring of love and respect. So many generations have yearned for it, but it was Yitzhak Rabin who defied the prejudice, hatred, and violence of the past to make it possible for us to believe that peace is possible in the Middle East. That was the message of the handshake on the White House lawn. It is our challenge and our

duty to complete Prime Minister Rabin's vision.

The Congress can be a potent force for peace. Too often we have seen some Members of Congress make fervent speeches and sponsor amendments that may have won points with constituencies here or at home but actually serve to sow divisiveness and undermine progress toward peace in the Middle East.

Just as Prime Minister Rabin pleaded so passionately at the White House for an end to blood and tears, let us put an end to partisan political maneuvering on a subject so important and fragile as peace in the Middle East. Let us stop conceiving of ways to legislate obstacles to the very policies of those who are risking their lives for peace. Let us remind ourselves that even though we might get some short-term political gain by trifling legislatively with the peace process in the Middle East, we do it here in the safety of this Chamber, we do it in the safety of our home States, but it is the lives and the aspirations and the hopes and the dreams of the people in the Middle East who are affected. Let us put an end to these political games and wholeheartedly support peace in the Middle East.

Let us do that for the memory of Yitzhak Rabin. Let us be united in continuing his legacy. Let each of us join the millions of Israelis who put their faith in him to prove the enemies of peace wrong. Let us listen to the words of Leah Rabin, his wife of so many decades, that wonderful woman who calls on us to unite in support of peace.

Mr. President, it was only a couple of weeks ago, here in this building, that I and Leah Gluskoter of my office last spoke with Prime Minister Rabin. I remember him coming over and putting his arm around me and we chatted as the friends I was proud we had become.

We talked a little bit about a longer conversation we had a couple of weeks before. In that conversation, he had thanked me for something I had been able to do for him that he felt helped the peace process. He said I had taken some political risks. I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, you are the one who takes the real political risk. You risk your political life every day." I paused and I said, "No, you risk your life, your actual life every day."

In that deep and wonderful voice, he responded he did not worry about that. He really did not fear for his life. He only feared for the continuation of the peace process. This is a man whose own political life, his own future, his own actual life was secondary to what he was trying to accomplish.

I told him in that conversation that I felt when the history of this century is written, there will be a handful of people who will stand out as true peacemakers of this century, and he will be among them. He will be one of the most noted, certainly, of my lifetime.

Now he is gone, and it is our job to go forward. Let me say again that we can

give the greatest respect to Yitzhak Rabin's memory by supporting those who believe, as he did, that Israel and its Arab neighbors have seen enough of hatred, of occupation, of bloodshed, and that there is another way. The other way is the peace process he began and which will now be carried on by acting Prime Minister Shimon Peres. Our country remains a partner with Israelis and Arabs in this effort. Let us go forward in the memory of a great man who gave his life for it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote on the pending question occur on the motion to commit at 3:30 this afternoon, and that the time divided between now and then be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at this time, I will say for my colleagues that Senator SPECTER is en route to the floor.

At this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, so much has already been said about the pending legislation, but, prior to the vote, I want to very briefly articulate my position and urge my colleagues to express themselves in the vote at 3:30 in opposition to the legislation as currently drafted and in support of the Specter motion to refer the bill to Judiciary and report back in 19 days.

I say that for a couple of very important reasons. First of all, there are extraordinarily complex issues surrounding this medical procedure that ought to be explored through the normal hearing process.

There are medical issues. There is the need to hear from physicians and others on the ramifications of a strict

ban on late-term abortions. This is an emergency medical procedure reserved for cases where the life and health of the mother could be endangered or where severe fetal abnormalities are a major factor in the decision made by a woman and her physician. Whether or not we can delineate very clearly and legislatively when a doctor should and should not perform that very difficult procedure is something that ought to be explored in ways other than those we have employed so far on the Senate floor. So, clearly there are medical issues that this debate simply does not allow us to discuss and consider adequately prior to making a fundamental decision about the legality or justifiability of this procedure in various cases.

Second, there are constitutional issues. As the distinguished Senator from California and others have laid out very clearly, this is a challenge to the fundamental decision made in *Roe* versus *Wade*. Decisions relating to whether or not States ought to have the ability to restrict late-term abortions in cases where the life and health of the mother is endangered—that, to me, is a question that ought to be pursued much more carefully, much more deliberately, much more clearly than we have done in the debate in the last couple of days.

Finally, there are legal issues. This bill would criminalize a medical procedure for the first time. There ought not be any mistake about that. It would be an unprecedented intrusion by Congress into the practice of medicine. If a doctor is convinced it is an emergency procedure needed to save the life of the mother, he can use that affirmative defense only in the context of a criminal prosecution. Should doctors be prosecuted for saving a woman's life? I do not think so. In an emergency situation, do we want doctors hesitating to perform life-saving measures because they fear they will face criminal prosecution for doing so? I do not think we ought to put any doctor, or any woman, in that position.

So there clearly are situations here where we owe it to doctors, we owe it to mothers, we owe it to women, we owe it to the American people, to explore far more carefully than we have so far the far-reaching implications of this legislation. So, for those reasons if nothing else, this legislation ought to be referred to the committee for very, very careful consideration.

Second, Madam President, if the procedure is being abused, then we should consider restricting it. But it is unclear that it is being abused. There is a lot of confusion and misinformation about this procedure. We need hearings to clarify whether or not abuse has ever been documented and, if so, how best to stop it.

There have been no hearings in the Senate and only one hearing in the House. Without having had the opportunity to listen to one expert, every Senator in this Chamber is being asked