

Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 3 p.m., on Wednesday, May 10, 1995, in open and closed session, to receive testimony on tactical intelligence and related activities in the Army and Air Force in review of S. 727, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, and the future years defense program.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Immigration Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing on "Verification of Applicant Identity for Purposes of Employment and Public Assistance."

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AN ETHICAL DILEMMA

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there is a lot of emotion and not much rationality to the question of whether we use fetal tissue to assist people who have problems, particularly with Parkinson's disease.

It is interesting that in the U.S. Senate, many of those who support the use of fetal tissue comprise those who are totally opposed to abortions.

I believe their stand makes sense, much more sense than those who emotionally oppose use of fetal tissue.

If for a reason of taste, or culture, or religion, people are opposed to any transplant, I understand it.

When I die, if my eyes or any part of me can be used to be of assistance to someone else, I want that done.

I would think most people who have had an abortion would want the same.

The requirements are very strict. You cannot make any money on it. You cannot designate to whom the tissue would go. You cannot even know to whom it is going.

Joan Beck has written a column in the Chicago Tribune that outlines the situation clearly, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, April 30, 1995]

AN ETHICAL DILEMMA—IN DEFENSE OF FETAL TISSUE TRANSPLANTS TO TREAT NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS

(By Joan Beck)

He was 59 years old and he had had Parkinson's disease for eight years. His body was becoming increasingly rigid and immobile. He had trouble moving and talking clearly. He had tremors he couldn't stop and he had to give up his job.

The medication that had helped early in the onset of the illness could no longer give him much relief, despite increasing doses. As the disease inexorably progressed, he decided to try a new, experimental treatment, despite the intense political and medical controversy that has marked its development.

Surgeons inserted several grafts of fetal tissue into one side of his brain. A month later, they repeated the procedure on the other side. The transplants came from seven donors, aborted babies from 6½ to 9 weeks old.

Within a few weeks after the surgery, the man's condition improved markedly, according to a report in the current issue of the New England Journal of Medicine. He could once again handle daily activities, even take part in an active exercise program. He needed less medication, but now it was much more effective.

A year and a half after the first transplant, the patient had surgery on his ankle to repair damage from a fracture years earlier. As he was recovering from the operation, he suffered a massive pulmonary embolism and died.

Studying his brain after death, doctors found conclusive evidence that the transplants had worked as hoped. The fetal neurons had survived, grown and were functioning, replacing the patient's damaged brain cells, just as the improvement in his symptoms had indicated.

An estimated 200 transplants of fetal tissue into human brains have been done over the past several years. Some have been performed in other countries, some under scientifically questionable circumstances. Results have been uneven and often discouraging.

The case reported this week is important because it is the first to prove that fetal tissue transplants can survive and function and that they can be linked to a patient's improvement.

The long-range implications are medical, political and ethical. The success story offers eventual hope for hundreds of thousands of patients, not only with Parkinson's disease but also with Huntington's disease, Alzheimer's disease and other disorders caused by brain cell impairment and destruction for which no good treatment or cure is now available.

Much research is still necessary, however. More data are needed about optimal size of the grafts, whether the tissue can be frozen in advance, which patients are likely to benefit, how long improvement will last, whether the underlying disease will eventually destroy the new brain cells.

Fetal tissue is considered necessary for transplants because it can survive and grow where grafts of more mature cells do not. It can take on new biological functions, unlike other cells. And the recipient's body is not so likely to reject it.

But the research has been slowed in the past for political and ethical reasons.

The problem is that such transplants almost always must come from abortions—and that has raised fierce and intractable opposition from pro-life forces. They see the possibility that women will deliberately get pregnant and have an abortion to provide a graft for a loved one—or even worse, sell the tissue on some sort of medical black market.

Even with tight controls, abortion opponents argue, using tissue from aborted fetuses will make it easier for women to decide to have an abortion because they can rationalize that some desperately ill person could benefit and that might ease any guilt feelings they may have.

Should fetal transplants eventually prove to be of great medical benefit and become widely used, it will be even harder to rally the nation to oppose abortion—the source of such grafts—pro-life leaders fear.

In response to anti-abortion fervor, the Reagan administration prohibited the use of federal funds for research using fetal tissue for humans, a major setback because most research grants are based on federal ap-

proval. Some experiments did continue, however, using private money, and in other countries.

Under mounting pressure from Congress, President Bush attempted a compromise. He authorized a grant of more than \$2 million to study whether fetal tissue obtained as a result of miscarriages and ectopic pregnancies—not deliberate abortions—could be used for transplants.

The answer turned out to be no. Out of 1,500 such fetuses tested, all but seven were unsuitable because of chromosome errors (a major cause of miscarriage) or problems with bacteria and virus contamination.

In 1993, President Clinton finally lifted the ban on federal funding for fetal tissue research. The use of such transplants is carefully governed by state and federal laws and government and medical guidelines similar to those that cover other transplants, including the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act which has been adopted in all states.

The stark facts remain. Abortion is legal in the United States. About 1.5 million abortions occur every year. Aborted tissue is now discarded, even though it holds the potential for successfully treating several terrible, intractable diseases.

Abortion is a tragedy, as is death from gunshot wounds and traffic accidents. But the success of fetal tissue grafts isn't going to encourage abortion any more than organ transplants increase car crashes and murders.

Research is under way to find other means to treat neurological disorders, some of it building on findings from fetal tissue studies. But until these experiments are successful, surely it is more ethical and merciful to try to use fetal tissue than simply destroy it. •

TRIBUTE TO THE GREEN MOUNTAIN BOY SCOUTS

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Green Mountain Boy Scouts and congratulate the Boy Scouts of America on their 85th anniversary. It seems fitting, indeed, that the Green Mountain Boy Scouts of America will hold its statewide camporee on the historic Rutland fairgrounds. While 10,000 Vermont scouts and 4,000 adult volunteer leaders will be marking the 85th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America in June, the Rutland Fairgrounds prepares to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Vermont State Fair.

To these fairgrounds in 1861 came 1,000 young men to form the First Vermont Regiment of infantry, the initial unit sent from Vermont to fight in the Civil War. It is my understanding that the first night in camp, a chill wind came down off Pico and Killington flattening many of their tents. It was a strong omen, for hard times were ahead for the Vermonters who went off to fight in that war. Before it was over, nearly 35,000 young men from Vermont would serve, and more than 5,000 would give their lives.

Those lads, every one of them volunteers, established a model of service from which Vermont did not falter during four bloody years. It is a model that we still find personified by the young people, and their leaders, who fill the ranks of scouting in Vermont.

Not only do scouts well serve the communities in which they live, they are constantly acquiring knowledge and skills which will serve them well in later years—and make them better citizens. In scouting lies much of the hope for America in the fast approaching next century.

It is reassuring to know that Vermont still has within its borders able young people willing to serve in the best interests of their State and Nation, as did the boys of the long ago Civil War days.

I want to congratulate the Boy Scouts of America on their 85 years of excellent service to the United States and welcome the Vermont boy scouts to my home city of Rutland for their celebration. Rutland is where I served in my youth as a boy scout. I hope the Vermont camporee is as enjoyable and successful as it is historic.●

WORKING FAMILIES ANXIETY OVER EDUCATION CUTS

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we should never lose sight of the meaning of the decisions we make here for ordinary Americans and their families. This point was brought home to me by an article in Monday's New York Times, "Families Await News on Cuts in Education Aid." I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This is a difficult time of year for parents of college-age children. Along with their sons and daughters, they anxiously await college acceptance or rejection letters and financial aid offers. They worry about children away from home for the first time, about summer jobs, about SAT scores and grades and about the job market for college graduates. But for the vast majority of parents, the biggest worry is how they will be able to make it all possible for their children.

This year, unfortunately, there is another gnawing worry for millions of families who rely on Federal student financial aid to make college possible. Serious cuts in these programs are being proposed. The Contract With America calls for the elimination of one of the key pillars of Federal support for college students—the in-school interest subsidy on guaranteed Federal loans. The Domenici budget plan calls for the elimination of this subsidy for graduate students, but it goes on to propose overall education cuts so severe that the subsidy for all students is called into question.

In addition, campus-based aid programs and other higher education programs are endangered by the severe cuts proposed in discretionary spending for educational activities. This casts a shadow over the future of the College Work Study Program, the Supplemental Education Opportunities Grant Program, the State Student Incentive Grant Program, and the Perkins Loan Program.

Mr. President, education has always been one of the most solidly placed rungs on the ladder of economic opportunity. For generations, American families have sacrificed to assure their access to the best education possible. That has paid off for us as individuals and for us as a nation. And yet many in Congress are prepared to turn their backs on this record of success.

As we debate the budget resolution in committee this week and on the floor as early as next week, there is clearly a great deal hanging in the balance, not the least of which are the hopes and dreams of American families for their children's future. I urge all my colleagues to read this excellent article and consider our country's future.

The article follows:

[The New York Times, May 8, 1995]

FAMILIES AWAIT NEWS ON CUTS IN EDUCATION
AID

(By Lynda Richardson)

These are uncertain times for the family of David and Maureen Grau of St. Paul, Minn. As they await final word on financial aid for the colleges that three of their eight children attend, they worry what sacrifices will need to be made, and even which child might not go.

The Graus know that some cuts in Government aid are likely. In the next several weeks, Congress will begin considering the strongest assault in recent years on the array of college loans, grants and work-study programs that many lower- and middle-class families have relied on since passage of the nation's first major Federal student aid program, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

And across the nation, governors and legislatures are cutting the state university budgets and considering deep reductions in aid for impoverished students.

But in the absence of decisions on what will be cut, the most the Graus can do—like thousands of other Americans—is make contingency plans and hope for the best. Two daughters will cram three extra courses into their full college loads next year so they get through school faster, saving tuition. And all three will work full time—or more—this summer.

Baby-boomers, the Graus were themselves beneficiaries of Federal student loans and grants back in the 70's. Mr. Grau, 44, is now a registered nurse; his wife, 42, is a homemaker. With an annual income of \$36,500, they save and scrimp. They have not bought new furniture, other than a couch, in 23 years.

The Graus hold many of the bedrock American beliefs that swept the new Republican leadership into office. They go to Mass every Sunday. They are anti-abortion. Each child has a chore at home. Now, they say they are feeling betrayed.

"We never questioned whether or not college education was available to us," Mrs. Grau said. "Loans, grants and college work-study were there for the taking. All that was truly needed was a desire, and now you have a lot of hurdles."

House Republicans have called for \$1.7 billion in cuts in money already appropriated in the \$34 billion Department of Education budget for the 1995 fiscal year. They have proposed \$20 billion in higher education cuts over the next five years.

The largest cut would come from ending the Government subsidy of interest on loans while students are in college, which could save \$12 billion in five years. Currently, a

student who borrows \$5,000 for freshman year owes \$5,000 at graduation. Under the proposal, interest would be added to the principal each month, so the \$5,000 would become \$6,000 or so in debt at graduation. Students would see an average of 20 percent to 25 percent more debt when they graduate, financial aid officers say.

Republican leaders, in their first 100 days, also suggested dismantling Federal aid programs that are managed by colleges, including the Perkins loans for needy students, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants and work-study programs in which the Federal government pays 75 percent of a student's salary and the institution pays the rest.

"It is safe to say that every low- and middle-income family with a student in college and hoping to send a child to college has a stake in the outcome of the debate that Congress is holding now and will be holding for the next few months," said Terry Hartle, spokesman for the American Council on Education, a Washington-based association of 1,700 colleges and universities. "Many families would find their plans for college disrupted, fundamentally changed or eliminated by major changes in Federal student aid."

But the Republicans who have proposed them say the cuts are necessary for the financial health of the nation. Bruce Cuthbertson, a spokesman for Representative John R. Kasich, the Ohio Republican who chairs the House Budget Committee, said of loan subsidies, "We think it's a matter of fairness. We just put this on equal footing with all other types of loans one would receive."

The potential cuts have stirred public protests and private anguish. In the Bronx, Elba Velez, a single mother of three, worries that the cuts will halt her family's fragile upward mobility.

"The programs that are being cut are for the people who need them the most," said Ms. Velez, who left welfare behind after getting her degree in the 70's. Her son is a freshman at Wesleyan University.

Carmen Vega Rivera and her husband, John, worry that their high school senior will never go to college. Financial aid was crucial to Mrs. Rivera's education. She now heads an East Harlem tutorial program.

THE PRESENT—BEING MARRIED WITH CHILDREN

The three Grau college students are among the nearly half of all 14.7 million college students who receive student aid. Two daughters attend Concordia College, a small liberal arts school in St. Paul, and the third is at the University of St. Thomas there. Besides the subsidized loans, the young women get a wide array of aid from the Federal Government, the state and the college, and both work during the school year.

At Concordia, Amy, a sophomore, who lives at home, received \$12,305 in aid this year. Her sister, Sarah, a freshman who lives on campus, was awarded \$13,308. The total cost of Concordia is \$15,550 for dorm students and \$14,500 for students living off campus. The Graus pay the rest.

Their older sister, Rochelle, a junior who plans to attend graduate school, is interested in biomedical ethics and philosophy. She received \$17,028 in aid this year to pay for books, fees and other expenses at St. Thomas, which has an average student cost of \$16,263.

Rochelle and Amy are lining up full-time summer jobs, as counter help at a fast-food restaurant and as an office administrator. Sarah will work as a counselor at a day camp.

"They are thinking maybe a part-time evening and weekend job also," said her