

News, July 5, 1993. His late colleague and fellow proponent of the partial-birth method claimed in material submitted to the House subcommittee that nonelective reasons to perform the procedure include psychiatric indications, such as depression and pediatric indications, that is, the mother is young.

Mr. President, one other comment. Some of the people who have advocated that this procedure should not be banned say it is very rare. I think they are incorrect. The stark fact is that unless this bill becomes law, more innocent unborn children will have their lives brutally ended by the inhumane partial-birth procedure. During last year's debate, the New York Times quoted the pro-choice National Abortion Federation as saying that only about 450 partial-birth abortions are performed each year. However, two lengthy investigative reports published last week in the Washington Post and the Record of Hackensack, New Jersey, reporters for both newspapers found that the procedure is far more common than pro-abortion groups have indicated, and is typically performed for nonmedical reasons.

The Record found, for example, that a single abortion clinic in Englewood, New Jersey, performs at least 1,500 partial-birth abortions per year—three times the number that the National Abortion Federation had claimed occur annually in the entire country. Doctors at the Englewood clinic say that only a minuscule amount are for medical reasons. One of the abortion doctors at that clinic told the Record

Most are Medicaid patients, black and white, and most are for elective, not medical reasons: People who didn't realize, or didn't care, how far along they were. Most are teenagers.

Mr. President, it is unbelievable to me that this unspeakable abortion procedure even exists in this country, much less that we have to take legislative action to ban such a procedure, as well as attempt to override a Presidential veto.

It is further unbelievable to me that anyone in good conscience can even defend the partial-birth abortion procedure. It is a fiction to believe that it is all right to end the life of a baby whose body, except the head, is fully delivered. In order to engage in such a fiction one has to take the position that the curling fingers and the kicking legs have no life in them. Those who subscribe to such a fiction are at best terribly misguided. It is time to end this injustice and the practice of this procedure. I urge my colleagues to join us in voting to override the President's veto.

Mr. President, I agree with my colleague, Congressman TOM COBURN, who has delivered over 3,000 babies. He is still an active obstetrician. He is a professional in this area. He said this procedure is never, never called for. It is never necessary. He knows. The people who are supporting this procedure are saying we should never have any re-

strictions on abortion; that if you can't have this restriction, then you should not have any restriction, period. That means abortions for sex selection. That means abortion on demand for any reason. Abortion is a method of birth control; in this case birth control when the baby's head is only a few inches from delivery; maybe just a few seconds. Maybe the doctor is keeping the baby's head in so that life can be destroyed inside while the baby's head is still in the mother instead of just a few seconds later when it would be recognized as murder.

Mr. President, how can you say when the baby's arms and legs are kicking that it is not a live baby? We need to protect the lives of those innocent children. We need to override the President's veto.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE OMNIBUS PARKS BILL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am waiting for one of my colleagues. But in the interim I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the prospects again for addressing the 126 individual bills in the omnibus parks package.

This has been the culmination of some 2 years in the committee of jurisdiction, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. As a consequence of that effort we are on the eve of initiating an action in this body that would result in the passage of this very important legislation which clearly is the most significant environmental package with some 126 bills that has come before this body.

As a continuation of my previous remarks, the conference-adopted amendments in sum serve to ensure that this legislation will rectify particularly the accumulation of inadequate funding which now totals some \$4 billion necessary to maintain our parks in a manner which is in keeping with the uniqueness and oftentimes the sanctity of those areas.

One of the amendments adopted and totally submitted by the Senator from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS, which addressed concerns of the National Park Foundation Act, is evidence that that amendment would serve to ensure that the legislation would not lead to unwarranted commercialization of the parks, or abuse by corporate sponsors. The theory, Mr. President, here is that this legislation would be implemented in such a way that it followed very much that patterned after the national Olympic committees which authorize certain very select stipulations with

regard to certification by the Olympic committees of activities that can occur in association with the Olympics.

For example, if a movie is made in one of our national parks, is there any contribution given to that national park to that movie? If there is a picture of an automobile, a new model portrayed in front of Mount Shasta, is there a contribution from Chrysler, Ford or General Motors to that park?

This is the innovative approach that we are hoping to prevail in the National Park Foundation Act to help fund our parks, not to commercialize the parks. We are not going to have the park sponsored by "Joe Blow's Gas Station," or something of that nature, I assure you. It is going to be in keeping with the intention of the park.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator, while he retains the floor, yield for a question?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction on parks.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I want to say to my dear friend, the distinguished colleague from Alaska, how much I have admired all of the work that he has done as the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and especially for his dedication to putting together and crafting a bill with a wide-ranging impact on our national parks and on other recreational land, and lands that are appropriate for preservation. I know how much that he wanted also to pass and have included provisions that are very important to him and to the people he represents in Alaska, and to other Members of this body.

I must confess that I felt that his ambitions were as great as they were worthy and that they were very likely to cause this body to not be able to act on many of these matters. As a consequence at the request of a number of Members of both the House and Senate, I have seriously considered whether or not it is appropriate to include in the Department of the Interior portion of our appropriations bill at least some of the important and not so controversial elements of that bill. I do have a particular interest—not that of a constituent interest—in one part of that. The Presidio portion of that bill is very important because the Presidio is by far the most expensive of our national parks and takes up a tremendous amount of the appropriations in which I supervise and oversee and chair in this body. To get the kind of community participation in San Francisco that we have desired to take some of the burdens of the local aspects of the Presidio off our hands so that we can better fund other national parks is important. So that was one element of the bill that we proposed to include.

I have been as delighted, however, as I was surprised at the ability of the Senator from Alaska now to put together a conference committee report which is ready to be reported and debated in the Senate. I simply say to my

colleagues they are not going to get the half or quarter loaf that was a possibility in the appropriations bill. This was an alternative if the conference committee could not work a way out. I am as committed and as dedicated to the passage of the entire bill that the Senator from Alaska as the chairman of the committee has submitted, I hope, almost as much as he is. It is, in the vernacular, the only train through town during the rest of this session, and I hope the Senate will soon be able to take it up and be able to pass it.

With that, I yield.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If I may respond to my colleague with reference to the Presidio in relation to the trust which is authorized in the legislation, it is my understanding the proposal advocated by some for the Government to manage that facility was somewhere in the area of \$1.2 billion. The intention of the trust will be to use some of the extraordinarily talented people in San Francisco who are knowledgeable on finance, development, and environmental concerns to come together and operate this similar to the Pennsylvania Avenue effort here in Washington that has been so effective in rejuvenating the downtown area. Obviously, the people of San Francisco are closest to that and the justification for that application working, I am satisfied, having met several people that I assume would be appointed by the President if, indeed, the Presidio package becomes law.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Alaska is entirely correct. The National Park Service is not set up to be the manager of the extensive and varied kinds of buildings that are found on the Presidio, very expensive to keep up, very expensive in requiring a great deal of sensitivity to lease or to rent in a way that is consistent with the land around and in the Presidio itself. So the trust is clearly the right way to go, and that is the leading element of the bill that the Senator from Alaska has reported. It is by no means the only one. As I understand from his notes, as many as 41 States may have projects that are helped by that bill. I hope, as the Senator from Alaska does, that the Senate will take it up promptly and will pass it promptly and it will be signed by the President. But in any event, that is the only way we are going to get from here to there.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my friend from Washington. I remind him, too, that Washington has some other interests. There is the Vancouver Reserve establishment and the Hanford Reach protection that are associated with the State of Washington exclusively. There are currently 126 individual bills in this package, and the significance of it, as the Senator well knows, is the result of a great deal of individual Members' and staffs' time, commitment, and hearings that have resulted in the last 2 years of effort.

Now, some of my friends tell me they have been at their individual bills

longer than that. I want to assure my friend from Washington that those items that the administration identified as items, in their opinion, warranting a veto—the Tongass was one, Utah wilderness, grazing, the Minnesota boundary waters—all have been removed. I am sure if the administration wants to find something to veto, why, they will choose to do that, but they should also bear the responsibility of accountability for the very positive aspects of this bill which do represent some 41 States' interests and 126 individual participations in this position.

I thank my friend from Washington for his statement relative to the fact that this is the train. It has left the station. I encourage my colleagues to recognize that, if we do not do it now, it simply will not get done. I thank my friend from Washington.

I will conclude my references with the remainder of my statement, Mr. President, relative to a little more enlightenment on the issue. I again refer to the National Park Foundation Act and the aspects of ensuring that we will get the balance necessary to ensure that the parks are not victimized by commercialization associated with this amendment, which would simply relieve some of the appropriation process to ensure that the funds can be contributed by appropriate corporate sponsors related to legitimate activities that are allowed in the parks similar to what I have described relative to movie background and the tradition there has been no consideration given to the parks for that and other types of activities in keeping with the sanctity of the park.

I do want to expand on one more item of major importance which I think some would suggest is as important to some extent as the Presidio and that is the California bay delta environmental enhancement legislation which is in there. This provision is backed by virtually everyone and is equal to or certainly on a par with the Everglades initiative in its significance because those of us who are familiar with the bay area recognize what this bay delta environmental enhancement legislation would do to clean up the bay. The authorities in this bill will allow for massive restoration, massive cleanup in San Francisco Bay and the delta region.

As I have indicated in the colloquy with my friend from Washington, this legislation touches nearly every State in the Nation, and while we attempted to address the concerns of all of our colleagues, as I have indicated, some of the items fell by the wayside either because we could not agree among our conferees, the House and Senate could not agree, or the administration could not agree. Of course, as I have indicated earlier, President Clinton made it very clear that if certain provisions were included in the package, he would veto the entire effort, no matter how meritorious.

As I indicated, we addressed that in the wilderness bill which was aban-

doned, the grazing bill which was abandoned. Unfortunately, communities in our Western States are not too happy about this. A portion of Minnesota will not have the benefit of motorized portages in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. In my State, the Ketchikan contract extension provision was left on the table because the President made it clear that he would veto the entire bill. This meant as many as potentially 4,000 jobs—1,000 direct, 3,000 indirect—would be the result of not including that contract extension. Those are the only year-round manufacturing jobs we have in the State. As a consequence, I feel very badly about this. These are jobs that this administration sacrificed in my State, in my opinion, to appease an environmental lobby, which I think is unfortunate because the environmental lobby has attempted to instill fear instead of reality and logic. There is a very positive reaction which could result from the Ketchikan contract extension leading to advanced technology in other mills. But, for reasons that are quite obvious, the objective is simply to terminate harvesting of all timber in forests. And this administration and the environmental community seem to be hell-bent to achieve that.

The administration seems to have continued to oppose any value-added use of the Tongass National Forest. I think it is difficult, and sad, when the Government turns its back on the men and women who have built communities and towns and made them livable for those who come after. I think it is a harsh action. It is one without compassion. And the explanation is, well, if there are people suffering, we will simply write a check; we will provide funds to offset their loss of jobs through various types of assistance.

That is not what built America. That is not what built my State. It is not what is going to continue to maintain our area. There are certain limitations on what taxpayers should be expected to do given what people want to do to help themselves. I think it is disappointing the administration has chosen to turn its back on our workers, again, effectively killing our only year-round manufacturing/processing plant in the State.

So, we have come full circle in the Tongass. Some of my Alaskan friends will reflect on the time when we were a territory, prior to 1959. They had a couple of sawmills. There was no real available timber at that time. There was no demand at that time. The Forest Service was not structured to any extent at that time. The theory was: How can we develop some jobs, some tax base, an economy in southeastern Alaska?

After the war, they began to look north towards the pulp stands. I might add, 50 percent of the standing timber is in the form usable for pulp. It does not meet sawmill requirements. It has virtually no other use than dissolving pulp. The question is, are we going to allow this 50 percent of timber in

southeastern Alaska to be exported to the pulp mills in the south 48, Washington, Oregon, British Columbia?

The head of the Forest Service, who later became Governor in the State of Alaska, Governor Hickel, initiated a plan to establish four pulp mills in Alaska. Two of those were built. Two years ago, under environmental opposition, the Sitka mill was closed. Today, or in the not too distant future, we are about to see the termination of the one remaining mill, the Ketchikan pulp mill. So we made full circle to where we were when we were a territory. We have no utilization of 50 percent of the timber, other than to export it to mills in the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia, exporting our jobs, exporting our tax base.

There are a lot of unhappy Alaskans as a consequence of the inability of this administration to consider the merits of extending the contract so the \$200 million investment can be made in a new mill.

So, the administration eliminated the chances for the pulp mill contract extension because there are certainly not enough votes in a Presidential election year to override a Presidential veto. I think it is truly regrettable that this administration has seen fit to make Tongass management an election issue, to pander to some of the extreme environmental groups who have established themselves in our State. I think we have 62 of them now. If you are not in Alaska, you are not a legitimate environmental group. They send their lawyers up to do missionary work, because everybody has a little different view and vision of Alaska. Their vision is that somehow Alaska should not be subject to any responsible resource development. Whether it be timber, oil and gas, mining, we cannot do it safely, really selling American technology short. They use their presence, then, for their cause or causes, raising money and increasing membership by advanced rhetoric, fear tactics that we cannot do it safely.

Mr. President, we are currently 51.4 percent dependent on imported oil. In 1973, we were 36 percent dependent on imported oil. The Department of Energy says by the year 2000, 4 years away, we will be 66 percent dependent on imported oil.

We are exporting our jobs, we are exporting our dollars, we are exposing the national energy security interests of this country to the whims of the Mideast that we have become so dependent on. We will pay the piper. The public will blame Government. They will blame the industry. We have been producing 25 percent of the total crude oil for the last 18 years. It is in decline. We can replace it. We have the know-how. But America's environmental community says no.

They do not say no with an alternative; they simply say no, because it generates membership and the American people cannot go up and look at it. They cannot go up and look at Endi-

cott, which is now the seventh largest producing field in North America. The footprint is 54 acres. If we could develop, with the technology we have, the ANWR area would be 12,500 acres or less, about the size of the Dulles International Airport if the rest of Virginia were wilderness. Those are the dimensions. That is the technology. We will pay the piper and the environmental groups will not take any of the responsibility.

Their cause is fear. They have been very effective. And those of us who have tried to be a little more objective, I guess, have failed. That is where we are, certainly, on this issue, with the loss of our only manufacturing plant.

In conclusion, all the controversial items have been removed from this bill. The administration may not like every detail of every provision, but in total it is a very acceptable, very profound, very worthwhile package because it is for our parks and for resource conservation. It addresses the concerns of our national parks and our public lands. I guess it also represents what is wrong with our system, because Member after Member will come to me, as does the media, and say: Why did you have to have this huge package of bills? Why did you not pass them out? You are the chairman of the committee.

In deference to all of us, we know how this place works. Virtually every bill we reported out, every one of these 126 bills that are in the package, have had holds placed on them after we moved them out of committee, reported them out of committee. This is a right, under the rules of the Senate, but that is what is wrong with the process. So, after our efforts to untangle this and put it together and take away those items that were poison pills that the administration addressed, we presented the package as a consequence of the conference last night and our ability to have the House accept and send over the package.

We had one senior Senator who placed a hold on committee bills because of totally unrelated bills which the full Senate eventually voted, 63 to 37, to pass.

The abuse of the hold has contributed to the construction of this package. I guess one bill cannot move without another and another and another. The system needs repair so the Senate can proceed to meritorious legislation in a timely fashion on the merits of each individual bill.

I see other Senators waiting. This Senator has been waiting to bring the Presidio package before this body since 1 o'clock. I understand there is some concern on the other side of the aisle. We have not heard an expression of what that concern is. As I have indicated, if they are looking for an excuse to hold it up, veto it, then let's say so. Let's say so. Let's have it out. I am sure they can find one.

But if not, as the Senator from Washington said, if you are expecting some

of the issues, some of these bills to be taken out of the omnibus parks package and put in the reconciliation package as a consequence of work underway by the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, you have just heard the Senator from Washington, the chairman of that subcommittee, indicate that this is the only train moving. He is not going to take bills out of this portion and put them in the Interior appropriations bill and put it on the CR.

This is the train that is moving. We are ready to move with it. If you are going to hold up the train, you have to bear the responsibility for 41 States that are affected here—37 to 41, depending. Some of them are double-counted, like New Jersey and New York, because they affect both States, or the 126 individual bills that are in the package.

I encourage my colleagues to either come to the floor and indicate why they find it unacceptable, or face up to the opportunity we have now and pass it now. Procedurally, the last point I want to make is, if there is a motion that prevails to recommit, the package is dead. It is over. That is it once and for all. It is gone. We have lost our opportunity.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, may I inquire what the procedure is at the current time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators can speak in morning business.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to speak on the issue that we will be debating at some length tomorrow, partial-birth abortion. My understanding is we have reserved a considerable amount of time for debate tomorrow.

I think it is important we have that debate. Clearly, we are heading toward perhaps one of the most difficult, but most important, votes in the U.S. Senate, difficult because it deals with an issue of such immense consequences that I think it is important that each Senator focus very clearly on the issue at hand.

This is not another one of those issues where I think anybody can just simply say, "Well, I'm pro-life." "I'm pro-choice." "What is the pro-life vote?" "What is the pro-choice vote?" "Tell me what that is and I'll vote and walk off the floor and go on with my business." In my opinion, whether you are of the pro-life persuasion or the pro-choice persuasion, this issue deals with something of even greater consequence than that issue which is of extreme consequence. But this deals with something beyond the normal discussion that has taken place on the issues that would be categorized under the "pro-life, pro-choice" issues.

The President's veto of legislation passed by the Senate and passed by the