

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS—VETO OVERRIDE

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to, No. 1, congratulate the House of Representatives for their strong, bipartisan support for the override of the President's veto on the issue of partial-birth abortions.

The House did speak strongly yesterday and did speak in a bipartisan fashion. I had the opportunity to look at some of the debate and hear some of the debate. I was impressed with the strong bipartisanship. I was impressed with how articulate Members were on debating an issue which is a very emotional issue, a very difficult issue to talk about. This is not a procedure that many people feel very comfortable discussing. I think the Members who got up and spoke on behalf of the override spoke factually, compassionately, restrained, and, as a result, I think that kind of debate is what I hope to emulate here. I hope we see it emulated here on the floor of the U.S. Senate next week. We will have a vote here next week in the U.S. Senate on whether to override the President's veto. We are only halfway home to accomplish that.

Much has been written today about the likelihood of whether the Senate will do so and reporting that it appears that the possibility of overriding the President's veto of this is dim here in the Senate. I remind everyone that in the House, when the original vote was taken, there were not sufficient votes to override the President's veto. But as a result of educational efforts that had taken place by physicians and people who are concerned about this issue with Members of the House, a number of Members were persuaded to go along with the override.

I hope that occurs here. I hope Members who voted against the bill to outlaw this procedure, who voted to allow this procedure to continue, do take the opportunity to gather more information, because since the original passage of this bill, additional information has come out, even as late as this week.

We have a story in the Bergen County Record. A health reporter for the Bergen County Record did a report on partial-birth abortions in New Jersey, where, according to all of the abortion rights advocates, there aren't partial-birth abortions being done in New Jersey.

In fact, they were only done, according to them, by a couple of doctors

which totaled about 500 a year. We find out from the health reporter of the Bergen County Record in her interviews with abortionists in New Jersey that they perform roughly 3,000 second- and third-trimester abortions, and approximately half of those 3,000 abortions are done in what is called "intact D&E"—which is a partial-birth abortion.

So we know that just in the State of New Jersey there are 1,500 such abortions—just done in the State of New Jersey. And we are talking about abortions that are performed at at least 20 weeks.

My wife is a neonatal intensive care nurse. She worked as one for 9 years. We have three children. We are very blessed to have one more on the way. She knows a lot about premature babies. She has cared for a lot. She has cared for 22-week-old babies. She has cared for 22-week-old babies that are alive and well today—many of them. She has cared for a lot of 24-weekers that are alive and well today. And she certainly has cared for a lot of babies that are 24 weeks, 29 weeks, and 34 weeks who are alive and well, and very normal and very healthy.

The question is not whether we should have late- and second-term, or third-term abortions. I believe that is a legitimate question to ask in this country. But that is not the question that is before us with this override. This override deals with a medical procedure which I think is one of the most gruesome medical procedures that if it was being done in China today human rights activists would be calling on us to sanction China. If it was done on a dog, animal rights activists would be storming the Capitol saying it is inhumane. But if it is done on a 30-week-old baby that is fully viable outside the womb it is a choice; it is not a baby; it is a choice. It is up to the doctor and the mother to determine what happens to that baby. It is a choice; it is not a baby.

I do not think that is what most of America is. When we talk about this procedure being done on late second- and third-trimester babies, a procedure that delivers the entire baby feet first—delivers the baby from the shoulders down completely outside the mother; the arms and legs of the baby are moving outside of the mother; the head is held inside the birth canal—a pair of scissors is taken and jammed into the base of the skull, a suction catheter is placed in the skull and the brains are sucked out. As a result of that the head collapses, and then they deliver the rest of the baby.

I was on the Fox Morning News yesterday morning with a woman who works for an abortion rights advocacy group. And I asked her a question, which I will ask every Member of the Senate who speaks on this issue. I hope they have an answer for me, because she didn't. My question was very simple. It was a very logical question. "What would your position be if the

head of that baby had somehow slipped out; had somehow when the shoulders were delivered had been delivered also? Would it be the woman's choice and the doctor's choice when the baby is completely removed to kill that baby? Is that then murder? Or, if you hold the baby's head inside the birth canal, it is not murder? Explain for me the difference. Answer the question."

I know that question has been asked a lot in the last few months. And, to my knowledge, no one has answered the question. But I think you have to answer that question, don't you? Don't you have to answer a question that, if just an inch more, maybe 2 inches more, it is murder? Most Americans would consider it as murder without question. But as long as that doctor is holding the baby in, it is not murder. We are blurring the line in this country a lot. It is more than blurring. It is more of a sign of a culture that has lost its way, that does not understand what its underpinnings are any more; what its vision is; what its purpose is; what it stands for; who it cares about.

This issue is not about abortion. This is about a procedure that is so horrendous and that is so disgusting that everyone in America should say, "No. That is not who we are." For we in this country are not what we say we are. It is not what we would like to tell the American public we are. We are in this country what we do. And when we do something like this to children who doctors who perform this procedure say are healthy, elective abortions—these are elective abortions; there is no medical necessity; there is no fetal abnormality but simply healthy children—when the vast majority of these abortions are done at that time and in this way we have to say no.

I am hopeful, I am prayerful that the Members of the U.S. Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, will live up to that, live up to that title, and will truly deliberate—not react to the special interests, or to the emotion of the moment, or to some political posture that you feel locked into because, you know, "I am for choice"—but deliberately, thoughtfully, prayerfully about who we are, about what we stand for as a country. I think if we do that—and if all of you who care about who we are, about what is to become of us, will write and call and pray for Members of the Senate over this next week—then truly remarkable things can still happen in this country and in this body, and we will surprise a lot of people next week.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to make a few remarks concerning the Senator from Iowa's comments and his three amendment. First, I oppose his VISA program amendment. The amendment would require Maritime Security Fleet Program [MSFP] contractors to participate in Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreements [VISA]. This change is unnecessary. The bill already requires MSFP participants to enter into Emergency Preparedness Agreements [EPA]. EPA is the same as the VISA program, with several improvements suggested and supported by the Defense Department. The Senator's amendment would limit the Department of Defense's ability to access all of a contractor's assets. This would handcuff DOD's ability to tailor commercial sealift assets to meet DOD's sealift needs. The DOD helped write this bill. The bill provides the flexibility DOD wants. Further, it would impose additional restrictions that are not found in the bill or even in the existing VISA program that is voluntary today. This amendment simply does not make sense—it would impose additional costs on moving government goods. It would cost taxpayers more, not less. I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing this amendment.

Second, I oppose his lobbying and campaign contribution amendment. The amendment would prohibit the use of funds provided to Maritime Security Fleet Program [MSFP] contractors from being used to fund lobbying or public education efforts or campaign contributions. This amendment is unnecessary and unfairly singles out one industry with which the Government enters contracts.

Current Government contracting and Federal election campaign laws prohibit the use of Government funds for these purposes. The Byrd amendment, 31 U.S.C. 1352, generally prohibits recipients of Federal contracts, grants, loans, and cooperative agreements from using appropriated funds for lobbying the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement. There is absolutely no legal basis for restricting the lawful activities of the employees of the recipients, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa. A logical extension of this suggestion would be to restrict the lawful activities of the contractor's fuel supplier or ice cream vendor. Any attempt to change current lobbying and campaign contribution restrictions should be broader in scope so as to treat all such recipients of Federal funds in a similar and fair manner. I intend to move to table this amendment.

Finally, Mr. President, as I said earlier, I am opposed to the Senator from Iowa's amendment on rates. All of these amendments are designed to kill the bill. They are killer amendments. I intend to move to table the Senator's amendment on rates. The managers of the bill will also move to table the sec-

ond degree amendment to that amendment that has been proposed by the other Senator from Iowa. The second degree amendment is just as objectionable as the underlying one.

Mr. INOUE. There is no further business?

Mr. STEVENS. Have we had an adjournment order yet?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not been informed of that.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I will take care of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I now ask on behalf of the leader there be a period for the transaction of morning business with statements limited to 5 minutes each with the exception of the following: Senator DASCHLE or his designee, 45 minutes; Senator COVERDELL or his designee, 45 minutes; and Senator MURKOWSKI, 20 minutes.

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

A SAFETY NET

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we understand on our side that we are drawing near the most intense period of the 1996 elections, but we feel very strongly that we should set the politics aside for the election process, and here on the floor of the Senate and in the Halls of Congress create a safety net from politics for our soldiers in Iraq and in Bosnia or wherever they may be, for our disaster victims that have just suffered the ravages of the hurricane coming out of the Caribbean in the Atlantic and tearing its way through North Carolina and other regions of our country, and, obviously, for our children and our seniors.

In other words, Mr. President, this is a time to put the people first, the people's business first, to not raise anxiety among the Nation but go ahead and get our business done, get the politics out of these Halls, out of the city, and let those questions be settled by the American people in the actual election process. Once again, we should create a safety net from the political era for our soldiers in Iraq, our disaster victims in the United States, our children, and our seniors.

Mr. President, in that regard, I commend the leaders on our side, the Speaker of the House, Speaker GINGRICH, and the Senate majority leader, TRENT LOTT of Mississippi. Yesterday, they came before the American people, having met with the Republican leadership of the Appropriations Committee, and released the following statement:

We have already made substantial progress on appropriations bills for the 1997 fiscal year, with action completed or virtually completed on nine separate bills. We are committed to reaching an agreement with the administration on the remaining bills and completing congressional action by September 27th.

It is clear that Senate Democrats are using delaying tactics and political stunts designed more for the upcoming election than for the completion of the people's business. We have approached the consideration of these bills in good faith, but we have been met at every turn by gridlock, apparently coordinated by the White House. We refuse to be a part of this game. We believe Congress should complete its business and adjourn.

Given the Democrats' strategy to tie up the Senate floor, House and Senate leaders have decided that the Defense appropriations conference report will be the vehicle for final consideration of all uncompleted appropriation issues. The remaining issues will be resolved through bipartisan negotiations between congressional leaders and the White House.

In addition to reaching agreement with the administration on shared priorities like education and antiterrorism, we are determined to ensure that we quickly provide critical funding for our troops, for coping with recent disasters, and for those who are fighting the critical war on drugs.

While we are committed to reaching an agreement with the administration, we are concerned that we have not yet received complete information on their requests for additional spending. We look forward to active negotiations over the next days leading to final legislation that will complete the work of the Congress and stay within the limits of this year's budget.

Again, it is our goal to put a safety net under our troops, our disaster victims, our children, our seniors, and all the families that represents across our land.

Mr. President, on the other side, White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta has admitted that some Democrats would like to force Republicans to stay in Washington longer. That sounds like it is designed strictly for political purposes. Now the other side uses a slogan, "Putting Families First," but if the White House allows these Democrats to force extended legislative days here and confusion and chaos, moving you to a point you would have Government gridlock, they are engaged in politics at the ultimate.

Mr. President, I am reminded that last year was a very difficult period here between the Congress and the President. The President likes to blame the fact that Government came to a close on the Republican Congress. He tends to forget, Mr. President, that he vetoed appropriations bill after appropriations bill. At least, Mr. President, at that time, we were fighting over an absolute core issue in America, whether or not to balance the budget, something that virtually 80 percent of the American people are wanting and demanding—very substantive.

Of late, Mr. President, we have heard—and I will read from an editorial in the Washington Times—that shutdown may have had more to do with politics than substance, too. Everybody