

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

House of Representatives banning partial-birth abortions, except in the case where the mother's life is jeopardized, forces us, I believe, to confront a fundamental question of whether we will have a society that is civilized or one that is uncivilized.

It is of such great importance and such consequence that I urge every Senator to examine carefully the facts—not the rhetoric—but the facts surrounding this issue. Facts that were—at least information that was purported to be fact during the original discussion of this issue have now fallen to new information, information that has indicated to us that we did not have all of the facts at hand when we made that original vote. Hopefully, that will cause some Senators to reconsider their vote. It certainly has caused some of those who have examined the subject and written about the subject to reconsider their position.

Richard Cohen, who less than a year ago, during the time of debate on the partial-birth question, wrote an article which was published in the Washington Post, and probably in other periodicals around the country, justifying his conclusion that the partial-birth abortion procedure was justified.

But after examination of what he called "new data about this type of abortion," he wrote a second article in which he admitted to having been misled by the data supplied by, and I quote his writing, "the usual pro-choice groups."

Ruth Pabawer, writing for the Sunday Record in New Jersey, after extensive investigation determined that "interviews with physicians who use the method"—that is the method of partial-birth abortion—"reveal that in New Jersey alone, at least 1,500 partial-birth abortions are performed each year—three times the supposed national rate."

It was stated on this floor a number of times, and has been repeated on this floor a number of times, that we are talking about a very rare procedure, one that is used primarily, and almost exclusively, in cases of extreme health distress or extreme risk to the life of the mother; that it is performed roughly around 600 or so times a year on a national basis.

Yet, a respected reporter writing in New Jersey has concluded after her investigations that at least 1,500 partial-birth abortions are performed each year in that State alone, and that most of those 1,500 abortions are not performed in situations or instances when the life of the mother is at stake, not even performed for medical reasons, but simply performed because the mother-to-be of that child has changed her mind; that circumstances are different, that there has been some indication of a problem but, in most cases, not even that, merely a change of mind as to whether or not that child was a wanted child. And so the abortion is performed.

If we extrapolate the 1,500 in New Jersey out nationwide, we are talking

about several thousand, if not tens of thousands, of these procedures occurring every year. This is data that was not available to us when we discussed this issue on the floor previously.

Mr. President, it was the Washington Post that reported that it is possible, and I am quoting, "and maybe even likely, that the majority of the partial-birth abortions performed are performed on normal fetuses, not on fetuses suffering genetic or developmental abnormalities. Furthermore, in most cases where the procedure is used, physical health of the woman whose pregnancy is being terminated is not in jeopardy. In virtually all cases, there are alternative ways to perform the abortion safely."

This is only part of the evidence that has been supplied to us and provided to us that was not available when we debated the issue earlier. I suggest this new data is something that every Member of the Senate ought to very carefully consider, because if a decision to support a procedure, a medical procedure, which, as Senator MOYNIHAN has suggested, really borders on infanticide—taking a child, sometimes five, six or even more months of gestation, a child that, if born, would, in most instances, easily survive, easily be nurtured to complete health—if that happened at that stage, then we clearly would have a situation that would require no medical procedure, no abortion procedure.

Yet, that child is, under partial-birth abortion, almost born, is within 3 inches and 3 seconds of birth and then killed, terminated. That life is terminated. The heart is beating, the brain is functioning, the body is complete, the child is ready—even though it might be premature—it is ready to become a functioning member of the human race, of the human society. Yet, that child, and I will talk more about this tomorrow, that child is then subjected to generally a probe or scissors punctured into its brain, a suction tube inserted through that hole, its brains sucked out of its skull, the skull then collapses to allow the abortion then of the dead child.

That is the procedure we are talking about. It may have been justified in some minds on the basis that this was a rare procedure. It may have been justified in some minds on the basis that this procedure was necessary to save a mother's life. We now know that that is not the case. We now know that in most instances of partial-birth abortion, that no such situation is reality. Rather, we now know that these are simply done as a feasible, medically feasible means of terminating the life of the child.

This Nation has, in its history, always sought to expand the circle of those who deserve equal rights under the Constitution, and deserve to be a part of this civilization. We have fortunately—and too late—but still fortunately shed the discomfort and disgust we once had, or at least some had, for

people of different color, and we have brought them into the full civil rights of the Constitution and of people in this Nation.

We have extended those rights to people of the other gender, women in terms of their rights and ability to vote. Our impulses have extended rights to those who are disabled. The Americans With Disabilities Act extends those rights. But the history of civil rights in this country has been an ever-widening circle of inclusion.

Yet, for the most defenseless in our society, for the smallest, the weakest of our society, we refuse to extend that right. And in this situation, in the case where the child is clearly beyond the age of viability, under any definition, when birth of the child simply means an extended hospital stay until the child is a little stronger and able to go home, with his or her mother, we have a situation where, in most instances, for the sake of convenience that child's life is terminated.

But, Mr. President, I do not mean to imply that this is a matter of numbers, that even if there were only 660 abortions performed on an annual basis that that would justify that procedure. Because even if one abortion were performed using the medical procedures used in partial-birth abortions or performed at the age of the child which these abortions are performed, even if there was only one, we ought to have this debate on the Senate floor. And we ought to have this vote, because this is a procedure that it is now clear is a procedure that takes the life of a living human being, a human being fully viable, fully capable of living on its own.

If this procedure were performed in another country, I would guess that we would be down here debating the human rights of that country, and there would be amendments offered to deny trade, to deny foreign relations, to reach out and call out these unspeakable procedures that are taking place in nations around the world.

If this were a procedure that was being performed during conflict, in a war, we would have people standing on this floor arguing and debating and offering amendments calling for war criminal trials against those who were performing the procedure. And yet, here we are standing on the floor of the U.S. Senate, and calling this a choice, a medical procedure, chosen by a woman in consultation with her doctor. And those of us who believe that this procedure should not be performed are being labeled as those who attempt to interfere with that choice.

Mr. President, I will have a great deal more to say about this tomorrow as we engage in our full debate. But I hope again that each Member would avail themselves of the new information that has come to light about this procedure, about the number of times that it is performed, about why it is performed, and would think through very carefully about the consequences of allowing this procedure to continue,

the consequences to us as a society, as a civilization, and what it says about a society that, under the mantle of law, allows such a procedure to take place. Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during my last days in Congress, I wish to state my unequivocal support of the restoration of funds to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. These fine agencies have sustained disproportionate and unreasonable cuts over the past 2 years, and the erosion must stop.

As coauthor of the legislation that created the endowments 31 years ago, I have felt like a proud father as both endowments have served the guiding principles upon which they were conceived. Overall, their programs have been remarkably successful. There has been overwhelming evidence of the positive impact of the arts and humanities on education, the economy, urban renewal, and cultural pride. It is important that two endowments be funded sufficiently to be able to continue their worthwhile and extremely effective endeavors to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. President, I am by no means alone today in favor of continued Federal funding for the arts and humanities. There is a strong bipartisan commitment. Earlier, Senator JEFFORDS and I circulated a letter signed by 31 Members that expressed their support of appropriations for the NEA, NEH, and IMS in fiscal year 1997 at current or slightly increased levels, and I ask that the letter be included in the RECORD. Other Members have spoken with us subsequently regarding their support.

The American public remains solidly and strongly behind Federal support for the arts and humanities. A recent Harris poll found that a 61 percent majority of Americans—to 37 percent saying “no”—would be willing to be taxed \$5 more in order to pay for Federal financial support for the arts. These people believe the arts to be important and would sorely miss them if they were not there.

In Rhode Island, the restored Humanities funding means quite literally survival for an extremely important project that provides fascinating information to all Americans, not just the residents of my State. With NEH funding, the Rhode Island Historical Society is reassembling the Papers of Nathanael Greene from over 100 libraries and collections scattered around the country, and is currently preparing the 10th of a total of 13 planned volumes. Nathanael Greene, you will recall was a Rhode Islander sent by George Wash-

ington to liberate the South—a task he accomplished with distinction. If work on the Papers stops now, it will be the history of Georgia and the Carolinas that would not be published. Interestingly, while Greene was alive, Congress promised to publish his daily letters and orders. How poignant that we fulfill this promise now.

As I enter my last days as a U.S. Senator—36 years among wonderful colleagues—I urge Congress to support the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services at a level where they can fulfill their potential and continue to bring American culture to all Americans. I hope to hear that the issues that are preventing the reauthorization of the programs of these agencies will be resolved amicably in the 105th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, June 18, 1996.

Senator SLADE GORTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR SLADE: As the appropriations process for fiscal year 1997 begins in the Senate, we wanted to take a moment to share with you our strong commitment to supporting continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the Institute for Museum Services (IMS). As you know, this issue of continued federal funding for the arts and humanities is one of great importance to us—one which was successfully resolved last year, in large part due to your leadership in working out the differences between the House and the Senate.

As you recall, last July, the Labor and Human Resource Committee passed a bill to reauthorize the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities and the Institute for Museum and Library Services—by a vote of 12-4. This strong show of bi-partisan support, we believe, demonstrates a continued sentiment on the part of the Senate to fund these agencies. Therefore, we strongly support your efforts to include appropriations for the NEA, NEH and IMS for the upcoming fiscal year and hope that we might see an increase over last fiscal year's appropriations for these agencies—enabling each one to continue the important job of making the arts and humanities more accessible to people all across our nation.

We recognize that you will face many difficult decisions in the weeks ahead, and ask only that you continue to keep in mind the positive and valuable effect that arts and humanities projects have in all of our respective States. The Senate's commitment to federal support will ensure that arts and humanities programs, activities and exhibitions will continue to be available in local communities—engaging and educating individuals of all ages—in addition to making an enormous contribution to expanding and enriching our nation's cultural heritage and artistic traditions.

We are grateful for your support of the reauthorization of the National Endowments as well as your leadership in managing the Interior Appropriations bill last year, and

look forward to working with you again this year.

Sincerely,

Jim Jeffords, John Chafee, Al Simpson, Bill Frist, Jay Rockefeller, Barbara A. Mikulski, Frank R. Lautenberg, Paul D. Wellstone, Carol Moseley-Braun, Claiborne Pell, John Glenn, —, Barbara Boxer, J. Lieberman, John Breaux, Bill Bradley, —, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Carl Levin, Bob Kerry, Wendell H. Ford, —, Charles S. Robb, Olympia J. Snowe, —, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher J. Dodd, Ron Wyden, Daniel K. Akaka, —, Thomas A. Daschle

HOW THE UNITED NATIONS BENEFITS AMERICANS: THE U.N. ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week, the 51st session of the U.N. General Assembly convened in New York City. To recognize the occasion, I spoke on the floor of the Senate to highlight some of the many benefits that the United Nations brings to the American public. The United Nations has furthered American national interests by working to promote peace and democracy, to protect human rights, to strengthen international stability, and to foster cooperation between states on a wide range of important issues. Today I wish to focus on one of these important issues—an area where the United Nations has made significant advances by enabling countries to work together and to find common solutions to common problems. Today I wish to discuss the unique role of the U.N. Environment Programme.

The 1972 U.N. Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm was the catalyst for the creation of the U.N. Environment Programme [or UNEP]. As a participant in those meetings, I eagerly supported the effort to integrate human development and the protection of the environment as two equally important goals to the international community. The establishment of UNEP ensured that all countries would have access to technical information and skills in order to develop and improve national environmental policy. UNEP has also served as a valuable forum for reaching international and regional consensus on laws and operational standards that reinforce cooperative efforts to achieve long-term sustainable development.

Because of its unique role within the United Nations as the only agency with the mandate to make environmental concerns the top priority, UNEP has facilitated U.S. policy initiative in the environmental field. As Secretary of State Warren Christopher noted in an address at Stanford University last April:

The environment has a profound impact on our national interests in two ways: First, environmental forces transcend borders and oceans to threaten directly the health, prosperity and jobs of American citizens. Second, addressing natural resource issues is frequently critical to achieving political and economic stability, and to pursuing our strategic goals around the world.