

than just class work, therefore their exposure must have left an over-all positive impression.

It is interesting that E-mail and Internet usage basically doubles for freshmen and triples for seniors when they are in school as opposed to at home. This can probably be explained by the fact that they may not have access to the Internet at home, or even if they do, they do not have the sophistication of technology available at the school. This does tell us that if these systems are available at schools, people will use it.

A fascinating statistic is that family computer use rises almost ten points between freshmen and senior years. This tells us that the computer education young people are getting in school may be influencing their families to try out computers with their children. According to the survey, about 90% of homes within this population own a personal computer. This can be compared with a national estimation of only 35%. This can be partially accounted for by the higher than average income in this area, but one has to wonder if the influence of computers in schools encourages people to go out and buy a home computer, and, further to avail themselves of high technology enhancements such as Internet access and on-line services.

CVU COMPUTER USE SURVEY

Participants: This is a survey that will be used to assist the United States Senate through the offices of Senator Patrick Leahy as they endeavor to craft legislation that will enhance computer access and resources to students throughout the country. Senator Leahy hand-picked CVU as a reliable source to retrieve this information. With this in mind, we ask that you take the time to complete the survey honestly.

1. What grade are you in?
Senior Freshman
2. Do you have a computer at home?
Yes No
(if no, skip to question 7)
3. Do you use your home computer?
Yes No
4. Do other members of your family use your home computer?
Yes No
5. How extensive would you say that YOUR computer use is?
Rarely used (less than 1 hour per week)
Sometimes used (1 to 3 hours per week)
Used Often (4 to 6 hours per week)
Used very often (more than 6 hours per week)
6. What are your primary home uses for the computer?
Homework/Word processing
Internet/e-mail
World-wide web
Computer games
7. Do you use a computer in school?
Yes No
(if no, skip to question 9)
8. What are your primary uses of the school computer?
Word processing/problem solving
Internet/e-mail
World-wide web
Computer games
9. How has computer access in the school influenced your overall computer usage (both at home and in school)?
Greatly influenced
Somewhat influenced
Had little or no influence

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT HEARING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have had delivered to each Senator a copy of the transcript of the Judiciary Com-

mittee's November 17 hearing on H.R. 1833, the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act, together with inserts and written submissions. Since the distribution of these materials, I have received answers to written questions from another one of the witnesses who testified at the hearing. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Dr. Norig Ellison to me be included in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN SOCIETY
OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS,
November 22, 1995.

Re H.R. 1833, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S.
Senate, Dirksen Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Thank you for inviting my participation in your Committee's hearing on H.R. 1833.

I appreciate the opportunity to reply to the written questions of Senator Leahy. The only one of the six questions which falls within my area of expertise is number four:

4. Do analgesics and anesthetics given to a pregnant woman undergoing an abortion provide any pain relief to the fetus, even if the medication stops short of killing a fetus?

Drugs normally cross the placenta from mother to fetus according to a concentration gradient. The effect on the fetus of drugs administered to the mother will depend on (a) fetal condition, (b) the route of administration, and (c) the timing.

a. Fetal acidosis will facilitate transport of local anesthesia such as lidocaine, which is a weak base, into the fetus.

b. Drugs administered intramuscularly achieve peak concentrations lower than intravenous administration, with the resultant decrease in placenta transport of the former.

c. Drug administration intramuscularly will have no effect on infants born within one hour after administration; in contrast, birth 2-3 hours after intramuscular administration may result in depressed infants. Conversely, intravenous administration of drugs will have maximum depressed effect in babies born ½-1 hour after the administration.

d. Very little is known about fetal response and consciousness to pain prior to 24-25 weeks gestation. It is clear that a pregnant woman can receive an effective anesthetic for cesarean section, and the fetus when delivered within the next half hour will be exquisitely sensitive to pain stimulus and will respond by crying and avoiding the stimulus more than 95% of the time.

In direct answer to question number four, drugs administered to the mother, either local anesthesia administered in the paracervical area or sedatives/analgesics administered intramuscularly or intravenously, will provide not-to-little analgesia to the fetus.

In closing, I reiterate that the pregnant woman in need of urgent, even life-saving surgery, need not defer same due to misinformation regarding the effect of anesthetics on the fetus.

Sincerely,

NORIG ELLISON, M.D.,
President.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the impression will not go away: The \$4.9 trillion Federal debt stands today as a sort

of grotesque parallel to television's Energizer bunny that appears and appears and appears in precisely the same way that the Federal debt keeps going up and up and up.

Politicians talk a good game—and "talk" is the operative word—about reducing the Federal deficit and bringing the Federal debt under control. But watch how they vote.

Mr. President, as of the close of business, Wednesday, November 29, the total Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,988,882,588,134.46 or \$18,937.88 per man, woman, child, on a per capita basis. Res ipsa loquitur.

Some control.

THE ASSASSINATION OF YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, earlier this month, the whole world stopped to pay respects to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, a soldier, a statesman, and a visionary committed to security and peace for the people of Israel and of the entire Middle East.

Yitzhak Rabin dedicated his life to the survival of the State of Israel and to the crusade for peace, a crusade that ultimately took his life. His death is not only a loss for his family, the people of Israel and Jews across the world, but also to all those dedicated to the search for a true and lasting peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

As a military leader, a diplomat, and a Prime Minister, Yitzhak Rabin was at the center of major events through his nation's five decade history. It was, after all, General Rabin who led Israel's armed forces to victory during the 1967 Six Day War. And it was Prime Minister Rabin who, 23 years later, on September 13, 1993, signed an historic accord that put Israel on a glidepath toward peaceful and normal relations with the Palestinian people.

During his professional life, Yitzhak Rabin did much to strengthen the relationship between the United States and Israel. As Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Rabin repeatedly communicated and demonstrated to officials of the United States Government Israel's unyielding commitment to United States interests in the Middle East and around the world. And in every other post in which he served—Army Chief of Staff, Defense Minister, and Prime Minister—Yitzhak Rabin always earned the respect, admiration, and friendship of American leaders from both parties.

While I did not know Yitzhak Rabin personally, I had the honor of joining him at the White House some weeks ago for the signing of the Oslo II Agreement, one of the many historic developments of which Mr. Rabin was an architect. I remember at that ceremony thinking about how much progress had been made in the Middle East over the past several years. I was impressed by the extent to which this fragile peace process had been kept on track despite

what seemed at times to be insurmountable hurdles. Yitzhak Rabin was critical to keeping the delicate process moving forward. This, however, was not his only accomplishment since he began his second term as Prime Minister in 1993. Prime Minister Rabin orchestrated the Israel-Jordan Peace Treaty, the normalization of relations between Israel and Tunisia, Israel and Morocco, and the acceptance of Israel by many others in the Arab world and around the globe.

Mr. President, on November 6, I joined some 4,500 members of Detroit's distinguished Jewish Community to pay tribute to Yitzhak Rabin at a memorial ceremony organized in my State by the Detroit Jewish community Council and the Detroit Jewish Federation. It was an incredibly moving experience for me and my wife Jane. We listened to Jewish leaders from Detroit talk about their memories of the slain Israeli leader and all he had meant to the Jewish people. I especially was struck by the message of the last individual who spoke that evening, Rabbi Steven Wiel. During his remarks, Rabbi Wiel posed the following question: "Do we not love what we love more than we hate what we hate? Do we not love the chance for peace, do we not love the state of Israel, do we not love our Jewish brethren, do we not love human life more than we may hate decisions made by political leaders with whom we may disagree?"

Mr. President, the hatred that Rabbi Wiel spoke of may have been acted upon by Yigal Amir in Tel Aviv on November 4, but it exists in various forms throughout the Middle East and in too many other places in the world. This hatred can be found in individuals of all faiths and of all nationalities. And if we truly are committed to a lasting peace in the Middle East, we not only must help Israel overcome its most recent tragedy, but we must also unite leaders from the entire region against the hatred of those who have tried and will continue to try to derail this peace process through heinous and murderous crimes. In this vein, I have already pledged my strong support for Mr. Rabin's successor, Shimon Peres, and I commend Israel's leaders from across the political spectrum for seeking to unify the Israeli people during this tragic time. It is absolutely essential that the United States stand behind Prime Minister Peres and the citizens of Israel as they work to overcome this crisis and continue to work toward peace.

I believe the greatest way the United States can pay tribute to our partner, Yitzhak Rabin, is to continue to assist the efforts of those trying to make peace in the Middle East. Any peace that is achieved forever will be attached to the name of Israeli leader and peacemaker Yitzhak Rabin.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk. I ask it be properly referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be properly referred.

Mr. GLENN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GLENN and Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1439 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

BOSNIA

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, our Nation has always been willing to fight for the values and freedoms that our Nation, our flag, and our Constitution represents. We have always met that test. America and Americans have always stepped forward. My father served in World War II, my uncles, our neighbors, sons, daughters. That was a time and a war when every American understood that our basic way of life was being threatened. There was a direct obligation for each and every American to do his or her part, and Americans met that challenge, and individuals were willing to face the dangers of loss of life to protect and preserve the freedoms that the next generation of Americans share today.

Mr. President, I submit, there is no compelling American interest in Bosnia that meets that standard that would jeopardize or put our children and our grandchildren in such a dangerous situation. It is an unwinnable, untenable civil war in a place called Bosnia.

As a parent, I do not wish my sons or daughters put in harm's way, and I cannot imagine that any other parent would be willing to risk the lives of their children in a peacekeeping operation in Bosnia.

The President has not made a compelling case to sacrifice one American life, let alone place 20,000 U.S. troops in a dangerous, dangerous situation. Sending American troops to Bosnia is unnecessary, it is wrong, and I will oppose it with every fiber in my body.

Mr. President, I will have more to say about that. But let me suggest to you, getting 20,000 troops in may look somewhat grand as they come marching off, as the tanks roll in, as there will be crowds well orchestrated for the TV cameras to see them cheering, but how long will they have to serve? How will they get them out? Do we really believe they are going to come out in 1 year? The administration is already wiggling on this. How many lives will be lost?

This administration's track record in being able to keep its promises and meet its obligations in similar situations has not been a good one. Certainly, it was a disaster in Somalia, when a mission that started out as one for peacekeeping and one to give food to people was changed.

Certainly, as things are unraveling today in Haiti, we have every reason to believe that upon the withdrawal, if our American troops are withdrawn on time, there will be an unraveling, once again, and the citizens of Haiti will find themselves, once again, at war.

I think it is naive to really think that by putting 20,000 troops—and by the way, there are going to be about 40,000 troops in that region, 20,000 in Bosnia. The cost is astronomical, not to mention the danger to our troops.

I think it is absolutely disingenuous for the administration to now come forward and say the United States will lose prestige abroad because they brokered this peace on the basis of sending U.S. troops there. They were warned repeatedly by this Congress, by this body, by the House of Representatives, that clearly we were opposed to sending troops there, and to say now that we are going to be having them there and for us to be less than supportive, and that this would embarrass the President, embarrass the Nation, endanger our relations with NATO is to ignore the fact that the President deliberately undertook this operation, was well aware of the opposition of the citizens of the United States and of the Congress and does not—and does not—deserve at this point in time our support.

Our support should be to protect the lives of our U.S. troops, to see to it that if we are going to enter a conflict—and this is a conflict that has been brewing for hundreds of years—that there is a vital national interest.

Should we work to bring about peace? Yes. But I suggest putting 20,000 troops in and promising to take them out in 1 year is not going to end over 500 years of hostility. It is wrong.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

THE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the entire Nation has its attention on the deployment of United States Forces to Bosnia. Congressional hearings on the peace agreement began this week. The President received a NATO troop deployment plan for the implementation force today. Many of my colleagues have made statements on the issue.

I have long urged that we lift the arms embargo in Bosnia and let the Bosnians defend themselves. This would have been the best option for Bosnia and the United States. It would