

⁵⁵ S. Rep. No. 94-597, *supra* note 29, at 3-5.

⁵⁶ See *Willis v. Van Nuys*, S. Rep. No. 281, 76th Cong., 1st Sess. 8 (1939) (rejecting recount because of the absence of a prima facie showing that it might result in unseating of the contestee); *Bursum v. Bratton*, S. Rep. No. 724, 69th Cong., 1st Sess. 7-10 (1926) (recount unjustified because no preliminary evidence was offered tending to cast doubt upon the accuracy of the official returns).

⁵⁷ See *Sweeney v. Kilgore*, S. Rep. No. 81-802, *supra* note 29, at 9.

⁵⁸ See, e.g., *Hurley v. Chavez*, S. Rep. No. 83-1081, *supra* note 28, at 265.

⁵⁹ For example, in the *Durkin v. Wyman* contest, the committee ordered a recount of the approximately 3,500 ballots that had been before the state ballot law commission. S. Rep. No. 94-156, part 2, *supra* note 29, at 8. The committee may also begin with a limited recount to determine if there are sufficient grounds for a wider investigation and state-wide recount. See *O'Connor v. Markey*, S. Rep. No. 1284, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. 3, 11-12 (1948) (preliminary five-county recount subsequently widened to state-wide recount in light of trend reducing incumbent's lead).

⁶⁰ An alternative approach is to count the ballots at locations in the state, and only bring to Washington those ballots remaining in dispute for committee review. See *O'Connor v. Markey*, S. Rep. No. 80-1284, *supra* note 59, at 3.

⁶¹ See *Durkin v. Wyman*, S. Rep. No. 94-156, part 1, *supra* note 29, at 4; *Heflin v. Bankhead*, S. Rep. No. 568, 72d Cong., 1st Sess. 36 (1932); *Peddy v. Mayfield*, S. Rep. No. 973, 68th Cong., 2d Sess. 3 (1925).

⁶² See *Hurley v. Chavez*, S. Rep. No. 83-1081, *supra* note 28, at 75; *Steck v. Brookhart*, S. Rep. No. 69-498, *supra* note 24, at 2.

⁶³ D. Tibbetts, *supra* note 38, at 60.

⁶⁴ See *Durkin v. Wyman*, S. Rep. No. 94-156, part 1, *supra* note 29, at 35; *Hurley v. Chavez*, S. Rep. No. 83-1081, *supra* note 28, at 276.

⁶⁵ *Hurley v. Chavez*, *id.* at 55.

⁶⁶ *Id.* at 16. In the *Sweeney v. Kilgore* contest, 22 investigators hired by the committee spent a total of 7,006 man-days over a period of 18 months conducting field investigations. S. Rep. No. 81-802, *supra* note 29, at 6.

⁶⁷ See *Edmondson v. Bellman*, S. Rep. No. 94-597, *supra* note 29, at 27-50; *Steck v. Brookhart*, S. Rep. No. 69-498, *supra* note 24, at 23-33.

⁶⁸ See *Pritchard v. Bailey*, S. Rep. No. 1151, 72d Cong., 2d Sess. 1 (1933); *Hoidale v. Schall*, S. Rep. No. 1066, 72d Cong., 2d Sess. 6 (1933).

⁶⁹ See *Willis v. Van Nuys*, S. Rep. No. 76-281, *supra* note 56, at 2; *Heflin v. Bankhead*, S. Rep. No. 72-568, *supra* note 61, at 20-21.

⁷⁰ E.g., *Sweeney v. Kilgore*, S. Rep. No. 81-802, *supra* note 29, at 18; *Hook v. Ferguson*, S. Rep. No. 801, 81st Cong., 1st Sess. 1 (1949); *O'Connor v. Markey*, S. Rep. No. 80-1284, *supra* note 59, at 17; *Steck v. Brookhart*, S. Rep. No. 69-498, *supra* note 24, at 15; *Bursum v. Bratton*, S. Rep. No. 69-724, *supra* note 56, at 10.

⁷¹ See *Hurley v. Chavez*, S. Rep. No. 83-1081, *supra* note 28, at 5. The Senate rejected the committee's recommendation and permitted Chavez to retain his seat.

⁷² S. Rep. No. 94-156, part 1, *supra* note 29, at 1.

⁷³ S. Rep. No. 94-597, *supra* note 29, at 1-2.

⁷⁴ Although the standard has not been expressly stated by the committee in these terms, this would appear to be the most accurate characterization of the burden of proof that the committee has applied in election contests. See, e.g., *Wilson v. Vare*, S. Rep. No. 47, 71st Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1929) ("it must be found, not beyond a reasonable doubt, perhaps, but it must be the conviction of reasonable men, at least, that the proof sustained the charges").

⁷⁵ *Pritchard v. Bailey*, S. Rep. No. 72-1151, *supra* note 68, at 1.

⁷⁶ *O'Connor v. Markey*, S. Rep. No. 80-1284, *supra* note 59, at 14; *Wilson v. Vare*, S. Rep. No. 71-47, *supra* note 74, at 5 (1927); *Sweeney v. Kilgore*, S. Rep. No. 81-802, *supra* note 29, at 7.

⁷⁷ *Id.* at 18; *Edmondson v. Bellman*, S. Rep. No. 94-597, *supra* note 29, at 22; *Heflin v. Bankhead*, S. Rep. No. 72-568, *supra* note 61, at 21; *Senate Election Cases*, *supra* note 5, at 384 (In *Sweeney v. Kilgore*, the committee found that fraudulent ballots did not effect the outcome of the election; therefore, the committee recommended that the state-certified victor retain his seat.).

⁷⁸ For example, in the *Hurley v. Chavez* contest, the committee adopted a number of evidentiary presumptions to govern its recount. Two examples are illustrative. The recount rules provided that, absent direct or circumstantial proof to the contrary, any erasure marks on a ballot would be treated as made by the voter and the ballot would be thrown out. On the other hand, where a ballot had been mutilated or had its secret number exposed, absent proof to the

contrary, someone other than the voter would be deemed responsible and the vote would be counted. S. Rep. No. 83-1081, *supra* note 28, at 268.

⁷⁹ Likewise, the Senate is not bound by the decisions of state courts or the results of state recount proceedings, though such state determinations are often accorded "great weight." *Johnson v. Schall*, S. Rep. No. 69-1021, *supra* note 53, at 9. For additional references, see *supra* note 29.

⁸⁰ 121 Cong. Rec. 18620 (1975).

⁸¹ See 84 Cong. Rec. 3611 (1939) (statement of Sen. George); 76 Cong. Rec. 3544 (1933) (statement of President pro tempore). See also *Riddich's Senate Procedure*, *supra* note 32, at 706.

⁸² *Id.* at 560. In the *Durkin v. Wyman* contest, both parties, together with their counsel, were permitted to sit in the rear of the Senate chamber during the debate. See D. Tibbetts, *supra* note 38, at 123. *Durkin*, by unanimous consent, was given the privilege of the floor. 121 Cong. Rec. 1472 (1975). No such motion was required for *Wyman*, as he already had floor privileges as an ex-senator.

⁸³ See S. Res. 2, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., 69 Cong. Rec. 338 (1927) (according William Vare "the privileges of the floor of the Senate for the purpose of being heard touching his right to receive the the oath of office and to membership in the Senate"). There were even earlier instances when counsel for the parties were permitted to address the Senate. See 17 Annals of Cong. 187-207 (1808) (statement of Francis Scott Key); *id.* at 207-234 (statement of R.G. Harper).

⁸⁴ See, e.g., S. Res. 123, 76th Cong., 1st Sess., 84 Cong. Rec. 4183 (1929) (*Willis v. Van Nuys*); S. Res. 115, 76th Cong., 1st Sess., 84 Cong. Rec. 3611-12 (1929) (*Neal v. Steward*); S. Res. 343, 72d Cong., 2d Sess., 76 Cong. Rec. 3544-45 (1933) (*Hoidale v. Schall*).

⁸⁵ See S. Res. 142, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 95 Cong. Rec. 10321 (1949) (*Sweeney v. Kilgore*); S. Res. 141, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 95 Cong. Rec. 10321 (1949) (*Hook v. Ferguson*); S. Res. 234, 80th Cong., 2d Sess., 94 Cong. Rec. 6160 (1948) (*O'Connor v. Kilgore*).

⁸⁶ See S. Res. 194, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., 67 Cong. Rec. 7301 (1926) (*Steck v. Brookhart*).

⁸⁷ See, e.g., *Senate Election Cases*, *supra* note 5, at 333 (Frank L. Smith, 1926-28); *id.* at 328 (*William B. Wilson v. William S. Vare*, 1926-29); *id.* at 283 (*William Lorimer*, 1910-12). *But see id.* at 314 (*Daniel F. Steck v. Smith W. Brookhart*, 1925-26).

⁸⁸ See e.g., S. Res. 346, 72d Cong., 2d Sess., 76 Cong. Rec. 5008 (1933); S. Res. 256, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., 67 Cong. Rec. 12633 (1926); S. Res. 211 & 212, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., 67 Cong. Rec. 10563-64 (1926); S. Res. (unnumbered), 47th Cong., 1st Sess., 13 Cong. Rec. 2047 (1922); S. Res. (unnumbered), 46th Cong., 3d Sess., 11 Cong. Rec. 1911-12 (1991).

⁸⁹ See 79 Cong. Rec. 14449-50 (1935) (declining payment of attorney's fees for contestant and memorialists in *Henry v. Holt* election contest).

⁹⁰ S. Res. 247, 94th Cong., 1st Sess., 121 Cong. Rec. 39861 (1975).

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1061, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Gregg amendment No. 1070, to prohibit the use of funds for national testing in reading and mathematics, with certain exceptions.

Coats/Gregg amendment No. 1071 (to Amendment No. 1070), to prohibit the devel-

opment, planning, implementation, or administration of any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statute.

Specter amendment No. 1069, to express the sense of the Senate that the Attorney General has abused her discretion by failing to appoint an independent counsel on campaign finance matters and that the Attorney General should proceed to appoint such an independent counsel immediately.

Coats/Nickles amendment No. 1077, to prohibit the use of funds for research that utilizes human fetal tissue, cells, or organs that are obtained from a living or dead embryo or fetus during or after an induced abortion.

AMENDMENT NO. 1077

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 1077 is now pending.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, we will be resuming discussion of the amendment I offered last evening. I don't intend to repeat all that I said last evening. I do know there are a few other Senators who wish to speak on this amendment, and, hopefully, we can accomplish that in a reasonable time and then move to a vote.

It is not my intention to utilize this amendment as a means of delaying a vote on the larger appropriations bill or specifically on the amendment that we adopted last evening, increasing funding for Parkinson's research, an amendment I supported and worked together with Senator WELLSTONE and others on this effort. I was pleased the Senate adopted my amendment related to the whole area of medical research so that we can commission a study which would give us, before the next appropriations and authorization cycle, a better idea of how we can direct research funds to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

There are allocations currently made on the basis of who has the best lobbying effort and perhaps who has the best champion in the Congress. While I don't in any way mean to impugn the motives of anyone here who is putting their heart and soul into providing support for research on a disease that affects them or that they believe is important and critical, I do think that in the interest of the widespread number of diseases that are currently under research at NIH and other places and the Federal funds that are used for that research, having a better understanding of where we can best apply those dollars to achieve the breakthroughs that can prevent the suffering and, hopefully, provide the cures for a number of these diseases is the direction we ought to go. We adopted that amendment last evening, and I am pleased the Senate supported that.

This particular amendment is designed to address a specific issue that relates to the utilization of human fetal tissue in research in a number of neurological disease areas. There is a broader question of whether we ought to utilize human fetal tissue and put restrictions on how that is sustained as

applies to neurological research in a whole number of areas—Parkinson's, diabetes, and there are a number of other neurological traumas that this could apply to. However, this specific amendment applies only to research in Parkinson's.

I offer it because this is really the issue in terms of where we are applying specific research and increase in research dollars, and we will leave the discussion as it applies to other neurological disease research areas to the NIH reauthorization bill or a more appropriate time. But I believe it is relevant to this particular issue because we are addressing the question of Parkinson's research.

I will summarize the two arguments that I made last evening. One is that we really don't have a pressing need to utilize human fetal tissue obtained through abortions other than human fetal tissue that is obtained through spontaneous miscarriages and through ectopic pregnancies. Because we have available to us some information that indicates that there is a diminishing viability of the utilization of human fetal tissue for Parkinson's research—it hasn't proved to be the promising breakthrough that we once thought it would be—there are alternatives to the utilization of human fetal tissue, specifically cell engineering, specifically utilization of animal fetal tissue, genetic engineering, and some other alternatives.

Second, there are more promising areas of research that don't involve human fetal tissue at all, that involve brain implants, that involve a number of other research areas which I could detail, but I did last evening and I won't do that again.

More importantly, however, than the question of whether or not this is even necessary to continue significant and important human fetal tissue in Parkinson's research, more importantly and most importantly, there are ethical considerations that I believe ought to give us significant pause before we just simply allow the utilization of human fetal tissue research.

A number of moral and ethical questions have been raised, and I raised those last evening. I think Members ought to consider those, particularly those who perhaps don't have a personal concern about the utilization of fetal tissue research. It ought to be considered by them particularly since we have alternatives that allow us to address this problem without utilization of human fetal tissue for this research. If medical research becomes dependent on widespread abortion—and this is a concern because if human fetal tissue is determined to be effective in treatment, when we look at the whole widespread area of neurological research, we are talking of potentially utilization of fetal tissue of up to 20 million fetuses. That presents a wrenching dilemma for those of us, and I think that is most of us in this body, who believe that abortion ought to be

rare, if not banned. For those who say it ought to be legal, safe and rare, we certainly would not be moving down a path that would allow us to limit abortions to only those that are most medically necessary.

Second, let me just say that the dilemma that is posed is that the person who is responsible for the termination of the life of the child is the very person who gives the consent for the use of fetal brain tissue from that particular child. It is not consent of the child for utilization of the tissue. The very person who volunteers to have an induced abortion gives consent for the utilization of fetal brain tissue for one who has no voice in that consent. I think that presents a real ethical and moral dilemma that each of us ought to contemplate before we cast our vote in favor of the use of human fetal tissue.

Third, I think there is a concern that we might be encouraging abortion by covering it with a veneer of compassion. "After all, there is a benefit," the thinking goes. "There is a benefit to this abortion because the product of the abortion can be used in alleviating human suffering."

We all want to alleviate human suffering. We all want to do everything that we possibly can to find a cure for these diseases. And yet we have to be confronted with the moral and ethical dilemma of the possibility of the abortionist, the person encouraging the abortion, covering the fundamental underlying question about the life of a child by saying, "Well, after all, we can mitigate your concerns because look at the good that it will do, the side benefit of the good that it will do." Ultimately that is a question that is a great question that ought to be pondered by each of us before we just simply say there is a great benefit to this fetal tissue research.

So on the narrow question of whether or not fetal tissue is necessary for significant Parkinson's research, I think we have answered the question in saying it isn't. There are alternatives available and there are many more promising areas of research that can lead us to breakthroughs in Parkinson's research.

And on the question of the moral, ethical dilemma, we can address that dilemma, particularly in this specific narrow area, by not allowing the use of human fetal tissue research with the exception that the research can go forward with fetal tissue obtained from spontaneous abortions or fetal tissue obtained from ectopic pregnancies.

So it seems to me that we have addressed this issue in a way that allows the research to go forward, utilization of alternatives other than induced abortions, on a voluntary consent basis, and in ways that will not present us with this horrible ethical and moral dilemma that I think deserves great consideration before Members vote. That is the crux of the dilemma that I have presented. I hope Members con-

sider that carefully before they cast their votes and not simply be caught up in "this is anti-Parkinson's, this impedes Parkinson's research, this has nothing to do with abortion, this has nothing to do with the fundamental moral questions here."

We can address this and then save and reserve the greater debate in terms of utilization of human fetal tissue for other neurological research at a time when we are addressing that specific bill. So that is the crux of the argument, Mr. President.

I yield the floor at this particular point in hopes that we can move forward to a successful resolution of this particular issue. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, one thing should be very clear in this discussion. This is not a debate that pits those who are pro-choice against those who are antiabortion. In fact, it is not a debate about abortion at all. The issue is whether Americans suffering from a host of dreaded diseases are going to have the benefits of the best and most ethical medical science possible.

Though the Senator has targeted his particular amendment on one particular disease, there is a broader issue that is raised and that ought to be considered, because if we accept it for this disease, it is going to be accepted obviously for the other diseases of which this process, this procedure is applicable.

Mr. President, let us review the record. And there is an extensive record because the Senate has already voted on this issue a number of times and spoken decisively in favor of ethical, controlled, scientifically valuable fetal tissue research.

In 1988, a Reagan commission, a panel of experts consisting of theologians, scientists, legal experts, ethicists, and pro-life activists studied this issue extensively and voted 18 to 3 to lift the moratorium on fetal tissue transplantation research.

In 1992, both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly approved bills to lift the moratorium. The vote in the Senate was 87 to 10. This legislation was vetoed by President Bush.

Again in 1993, the Senate voted to approve fetal tissue funding for this vital research. That vote was 93 to 4.

Each of these votes was preceded by exhaustive debate, careful consideration of all the issues and concerns associated with fetal tissue research. Each time the support for and recognition of the need for this research was overwhelming. Over the last decade, opponents of fetal tissue research have attempted to create a connection between abortion and fetal tissue testing. The use of fetal tissue in medical research cannot and should not be associated with the abortion issue. Past and

present supporters, pro-life and pro-choice alike, have clearly stated that fetal tissue research is a medical, not a moral, issue.

Many of my antiabortion colleagues, including Senator Dole and Senator THURMOND, spoke in support of fetal tissue research during the 1992 debates. They, like many others, recognized that supporting this research is the true pro-life position because it offers hope and a chance for a better life to individuals suffering from such terrible afflictions such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, birth defects, and spinal cord injuries.

Yesterday, we heard a number of arguments against this research. And I would like to review and respond to these arguments for the benefit of my colleagues because they are based on a misunderstanding of the facts.

First, we heard that fetal tissue research was no longer needed for the study of Parkinson's disease. Information from the Parkinson's Action Network was cited in support of these claims. I have today a letter from the Parkinson's Action Network correcting the RECORD. The letter states that fetal tissue transplant research shows tremendous promise. In fact it shows such promise that persons currently afflicted with Parkinson's are looking to the research as a likely source of major therapeutic benefit to them—if the research is not halted.

The letter further states that alternative sources of cells, such as genetically engineered cells, pig cells, and stem cells, may eliminate the need for cells from abortions to be used in the future. At the present time, however, it is vital that the research be allowed to continue so that the therapy and the alternative cell sources can be developed at the same time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

PARKINSON'S ACTION NETWORK,
September 3, 1997.

Hon. EDWARD KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Senator Coats' remarks have cited the Parkinson's Action Network's fact sheets, but by taking them out of context twisted their message. The following is the case:

Fetal tissue transplant research shows tremendous promise (see attached memo). The research in fact shows such promise that persons currently afflicted are looking to the research as likely to be a major therapeutic benefit to them—if the research is not stopped.

The alternative sources of cells, such as genetically engineered cells, pig cells and stem cells, will prevent the need for aborted tissue to be needed in the future. At this point, however, it is vital that the research be allowed to continue, so that the therapy can be developed and the alternative cell sources developed at the same time.

There is not one reported violation of the ethical protections separating the abortion decision and the abortion procedure from the

use of tissue. See GAO Report, March 1997. Thus, contrary to Senator Coats statements there is no evidence of changes in the abortion procedure in any instance at all.

Sincerely,

JOAN L. SAMUELSON, J.D.,
President.

Mr. KENNEDY. We also heard allegations that providers were altering the methods of abortion to obtain tissue suitable for research purposes, thereby putting women's health at risk.

NIH guidelines provide that "no abortion should be scheduled or otherwise accommodated to suit the requirements of research." To do so would be a clear violation of the safeguards that Congress enacted into the law.

As part of its 1997 study of adherence to these and other guidelines to assure that the research was conducted ethically, the GAO contacted the NIH's Office of Protection from Research Risks as well as the institutional review boards of each of the institutions conducting fetal tissue research and found that no violations of tissue donation restrictions had been reported or detected. None.

My staff called NIH this morning to verify that no violations have been detected or reported since the GAO study was completed, and we were told that there were none.

Concern was also expressed that the success of fetal tissue therapies would create an economic link between abortion providers and the research community. Again, I point to the NIH safeguards which prohibit the purchase of fetal tissue. Since no economic incentives exist for abortion providers, it is impossible to create an economic link between providers and the research community.

This issue has been debated and debated. Each time the opponents of the research have tried to argue that fetal tissue research will somehow stimulate abortions. Each time these arguments have ignored the extent of safeguards built into the law and regulations to assure that there is no link between the decision to have an abortion and the decision to allow fetal tissue research to be conducted. Each time these arguments have been rejected by the Senate and the American public.

The preservation and enhancement of life is the foundation of this research. Fetal tissue research and transplantation are not just clinical abstractions, they are transforming the lives of Americans every day.

A 55-year-old man who suffered with Parkinson's disease for more than 20 years and had lost much of his mobility is now able to climb mountains. A 58-year-old woman suffering from the disease for 14 years used to begin her day by literally crawling to take her first dose of medication. She is now able to ski and play tennis.

The benefits of fetal tissue research are not limited to Parkinson's disease. Recent breakthroughs in the study of treatments for a host of other diseases and conditions, including diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, spinal cord injuries,

blindness, Huntington's disease, cancer, birth defects, multiple sclerosis, and conditions causing intractable pain, are the direct result of fetal tissue research conducted on Parkinson's disease. If this amendment is adopted on this disease, it will be readily applied to those as well.

Any attempt to turn back the progress made in this area by placing restrictions on Parkinson's research will jeopardize further advances in the treatment of these conditions. These setbacks and delays will lead to unnecessary suffering for the millions of Americans afflicted with illnesses that are currently benefiting from Parkinson's research. Make no mistake about it, if the fetal tissue research is banned for Parkinson's disease today, it will be banned for every other disease tomorrow.

Every time this issue has been put to the Senate, it has spoken strongly in favor of ethical, scientific, promising medical research that offers hope to millions of Americans. I urge the Senate to reaffirm that commitment by rejecting the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I will take just a moment of the Senate's time to review the set of eight requirements that were established in the 1993 legislation.

First, informed consent of the donor must be obtained. Each woman must sign a written statement that she is donating fetal tissue for research without knowing who the recipient will be.

Second, the physician obtaining the tissue must make a written statement declaring that consent for the abortion was obtained prior to the consent of the donation and that the abortion was not performed solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue.

Third, the researcher using the tissue must sign a statement acknowledging that the tissue is human tissue and that it was obtained from an induced abortion or stillbirth. He or she must also agree to inform all subsequent users or recipients of those facts.

Any recipient of transplanted tissue must sign a statement indicating that he or she is aware that the transplant tissue is human tissue and that it was obtained from an induced abortion or a stillbirth.

Each agency head must certify that copies of all signed statements will be available for audit by the Secretary of HHS.

Recipients of funding for research must agree to conduct research in accordance with applicable State laws.

HHS must submit an annual report to Congress detailing compliance with these requirements.

And the purchase of fetal tissue is prohibited and no donated tissue can be transplanted into a recipient specified by the donor.

These were guidelines developed by theological, ethical, and religious people, as well as researchers. And we have the GAO study. And I will include the relevant parts of this study that was conducted by the NIH reviewing this particular program from 1993 to 1997.

And as the results say—I am directly quoting “Results in Brief”—“There’s been no reported violations in the acquisition of human fetal tissue for use in transplantation according to NIH and our verification efforts.”

By just reviewing this report, and I will not take the additional time unless there are further questions about it, there is a very clear indication that the guidelines that have been established in the 1993 legislation have been conformed with. It does not say there have been some violations. It does not say there is an increasing number of violations. It does not say that the GAO recommends further congressional action. It says there have been no violations, none, in 1997.

Mr. President, at a time when there have been extraordinary opportunities for progress in treating Parkinson’s disease and so many other diseases and conditions, and with the kind of protections that have been agreed to by ethicists, those religious and research panels investigating the utilization of this type of material, and with all of the hope and opportunity this provides to so many American families in addressing some of the most prominent ailments suffered by mankind, to try and restrict fetal tissue research in Parkinson’s disease and in other areas would be a dramatic and a serious mistake and would have a very significant and, I believe, grave impact and effect on the research and the opportunity for important progress in helping to relieve the pain and anxiety associated with these various diseases.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for laying out the case as to why the Coats amendment ought to be defeated.

I also want to thank Senator PAUL WELLSTONE for working so hard on this issue. He shared with me some very important information from the Parkinson’s Action Network, which also lays out the case in a very clear-cut way, by people who really know about what it is like to have this disease and how devastating it would be if the ban on fetal tissue research was put back into law.

For 8 years there was a ban on this research under the Reagan and Bush years. Finally, that ban was lifted, and we are seeing hope for many, many people all over this country. We really cannot go backward now.

I have said often on this Senate floor in relation to health issues that come before the Senate that when we act, we ought to act to improve the health of the American people. But at the minimum, Mr. President, we should do no harm. At the minimum, when we take a vote around here, we should make sure we are not hurting people.

I think the Coats amendment would definitely hurt people, a million people who have Parkinson’s disease, not to

mention the others who may well get it as a result of this amendment, because this amendment would stop the progress on fetal tissue research in reference to Parkinson’s disease. The prohibition in this amendment eliminates medical research, which shows significant promise of treatment or prevention of this tragic disease.

Let’s take a moment to talk about Parkinson’s disease and the real people it affects. According to the NIH, almost 1 million people suffer from Parkinson’s disease in the United States alone, with about 50,000 new cases reported each and every year. There is a myth out there that the symptoms begin appearing very late in life. That is not so. The symptoms begin fairly early in life, sometimes in the twenties, thirties, and forties. The average age of the disease is 57. I, myself, know several middle-aged mothers with children who suffer from this disease.

The hallmark symptom of Parkinson’s disease is the shaking or trembling of a limb, and in the later stages, a slow shuffling walk and stooped posture, not to mention the effects on speech. I know one Parkinson’s victim who actually has to crawl around his home—a proud, professional man who has to crawl around his home. The only hope he has, because he has told me this, is fetal tissue research. This man has a family. This man has grandchildren. They are watching this debate and they are praying that we will reject this amendment.

Will we deny these people the possibility of a healthier life, which may well result from fetal tissue research, which is already showing great promise, as Senator KENNEDY has said? Will we deny these people hope? Will we do harm today to these people when we have not yet found a cure for Parkinson’s? I certainly hope not.

I received a letter yesterday from two medical doctors at the Parkinson’s Action Network in Santa Rosa, CA. They emphasize the tremendous need to be able to continue to use fetal tissue in their fight against Parkinson’s disease. Let me read from these physicians. They know what they are talking about.

Neural cell transplantation using fetal tissue has greatly advanced our understanding of ways to replace degenerating cells in the brain. From this work, in addition, alternatives to fetal tissue may be developed. To close off arbitrarily any particular area of investigation is potentially to retard progress across a broad front by many months, perhaps many years.

They continue:

The ban on fetal research during the 1980’s was a crippling blow to progress in many areas, including Parkinson’s disease, Huntington’s and Lou Gehrig’s disease, spinal cord injury, and diabetes.

These doctors are telling us don’t go back to the eighties, don’t go back to the years where we stopped this important research.

Mr. President, I will share with you the comments of Dr. Jack Lewin, a

medical doctor who is executive vice president and CEO of the California Medical Association, the largest State medical association in the Nation, which has over 38,000 physicians. Dr. Lewin stated:

Research involving the use of human fetal tissue is responsible, high-integrity research. Using human fetal tissue to find cures for or to alleviate the symptoms of diseases such as Parkinson’s disease is a life-giving procedure.

Mr. President, I repeat that: “Using human fetal tissue to find cures for or to alleviate the symptoms of diseases such as Parkinson’s disease is a life-giving procedure.”

We are giving life with this procedure. Why would we vote to take away life by going back to the eighties when we had a ban on this because of politics? There is no place for that in this debate.

Dr. Lewin said that the California Medical Association promotes all legitimate research, including research involving fetal tissue. He continues:

It is important to dispel the myth that this research promotes abortion. This is not the case. On the contrary, research involving fetal tissue promotes the healing of crippling diseases. This research shows promise and needs to be pursued.

Now, on the issue of abortion, I am going to refer to the history of this issue where in 1991 and 1992, there was legislation passed which directly confronted this ethical and moral issue which Senator COATS talked about today. He says we must confront this ethical and moral issue. He is right. We did do that. We did do that in 1991 and 1992. Let’s discuss what is in place today in terms of the moral and ethical issues of abortion and fetal tissue research.

First, a woman may not be approached for consent to donate the aborted tissue until after she has made the decision to have an abortion. So, no woman can be told this prior to her decision.

Second, the donor may never be paid for donation of the tissue. It is outlawed. No one can get a single penny for donating fetal tissue.

Third, the donor may not designate who will be the recipient of the tissue, nor ever be informed of the recipient’s identity.

This is not a question where, say, a daughter says, “I will become pregnant, have an abortion and let my father regain the use of his life.” This cannot be done.

I think what is very important to know is that if you violate this law, you could be punished by 10 years in a Federal prison. We had a report and the report came back: “There have been no violations in the acquisition of human fetal tissue research for use in transplantation.”

So when Senator COATS talks about confronting the ethical and moral issues, those issues were confronted in 1991 and 1992, and the Research Freedom Act clearly addresses this issue.

There has been no violation at all. If all of our laws were so effective, I think we would be very proud.

Let me offer a specific example of how doctors are using fetal tissue to improve people's lives. Good Samaritan Hospital in Los Angeles was one of the first hospitals in the country to offer a new, promising surgical procedure using fetal tissue transplants. Many of the patients who received this procedure did so only after one of the most common drugs was no longer effective in helping their illness and their symptoms had worsened, some to the point where they compared their conditions to rigor mortis—in other words, total stiffness and inability to move.

Today, the vast majority of the more than 40 Parkinson's patients who have undergone the procedure at Good Samaritan have experienced moderate to substantial improvements in their condition. This is a life-giving procedure. This procedure gives life, gives movement to people. The issue of abortion is addressed in the Research Freedom Act and has been confronted and not one violation has occurred. We should be proud, all of us together.

According to Dr. Oleg Kopyov, more than 70 percent of the patients who got this transplant have shown "statistically significant improvement" on standard neurological tests. The other 30 percent are now taking 20 to 40 percent less medication. None of the patients' Parkinson's symptoms have worsened following neurotransplantation.

Do no harm. We should do no harm. The Coats amendment does harm, direct harm, to good Americans, and it takes away hope from a million people with Parkinson's in America. Said hospital neurosurgeon Dr. Deane Jacques:

We are proud to be in the forefront of treatments like neurotransplantation, which clearly have enhanced patients' quality of life.

Yet another example of the tremendous effects and great potential of this research comes from Colorado. A professor at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, who is conducting a study using fetal tissue, described the incredible effects on one participant earlier this year. He is quoted as saying:

We have a woman who could never walk prior to taking her first dose of drugs in the morning. Now she can walk before her first dose of drugs, and has resumed playing tennis. A typical transplant patient cuts the drug by 40 to 50 percent.

Why would we inject ourselves into this important nonpolitical health issue when, in fact, the issue of abortion has been successfully addressed in the Research Freedom Act? I cannot understand why this amendment is before us.

Mr. President, these are significant results of helping people. Why would we even consider closing the door on this promising life-giving research? We make progress in research by opening doors, not by closing doors.

I want to bring back the words of South Carolina Senator STROM THURMOND that he spoke on this Senate floor in 1992 when he urged this body to lift the ban on fetal tissue research. He said, "We cannot afford to lose this opportunity to develop a cure."

The Senator was speaking in reference to his daughter Julie, who has diabetes. He stated, "As a parent of a diabetic, I have a personal appreciation for the urgent need for a cure." Those were Senator THURMOND's words back then.

No doubt this sentiment is shared today by the parents, siblings, and children of those suffering from serious debilitating diseases such as Parkinson's disease.

Senator COATS said we are only stopping the fetal tissue research for Parkinson's disease. Yes, that is on this bill. What is the next one going to be? Alzheimer's? What is the next one going to be? It is not a good precedent. We took care of this issue. Anti-choice politics should not get into this debate. This is not about choice. It is about health. We addressed the issue. Let's move on.

I am going to quote again from Senator THURMOND, whose words 5 years ago captured the essence of the issue before us today, when he stated:

This is not a debate about abortion. This is a debate about allowing federally sponsored research that will serve humanity and may save thousands of lives. Passage of this bill [to allow fetal tissue research] should improve the quality of life for many people with devastating diseases and disabilities.

Supporters of this amendment may argue that fetal tissue research could still continue if this amendment were passed, as the ban would not apply to tissue obtained from spontaneous abortions or ectopic pregnancies.

But, Mr. President, we have heard this argument before. It remains as weak as ever. Doctors have addressed this issue in earlier debates, and have stated that tissue from spontaneous miscarriages is often diseased and is difficult to collect in a safe and timely fashion to preserve the viability of the cells. The same applies to ectopic pregnancies, which produce tissue that is likely to be non-viable due to the lack of blood supply.

So, really, we addressed this issue before. There has not been one violation. A woman may not be approached for consent to donate the aborted tissue until after she has made the decision to make the abortion. The donor may never be paid for donation of tissue, and the donor may not designate the recipient of the tissue. A GAO study reports not one violation. And if there is, someone is going to jail for 10 years. The issue has been addressed.

Mr. President, doctors have made significant progress toward understanding and treating serious debilitating diseases, such as Parkinson's disease, through research involving fetal tissue. But we are not there yet. I know that my phone has been ringing off the hook

from people who have Parkinson's disease. Some are pro-choice. Some are anti-choice. They know that issue was addressed in 1991 and 1992. They know that the only hope they have is for the doors of research to continue to be open.

I am so pleased that we will be spending more on Parkinson's disease. I want to see us double the research at NIH. And I have joined with Senators MACK, SPECTER, DURBIN, and others to make that a reality.

The enemies we face are right here at home. We fear that a loved one will get cancer. We fear that a loved one will get AIDS. We fear that a loved one will fall ill. We fear that we are going to lose our parents to Alzheimer's. These are legitimate fears, and these are legitimate areas for the Federal Government to be involved in.

I will say this. When Senator COATS says we have to confront ethical and moral issues, he is right. But what I don't understand is why he isn't proud of the Research Freedom Act, which does, indeed, protect against people saying, "Well, I am going to get an abortion because I can get money for this fetal tissue," when, in fact, that has never happened. That cannot happen. And it will not happen as long as we keep the Research Freedom Act in place. And there is not one Member of this Senate that I know of who isn't a strong supporter of that.

So, Mr. President, today we have a million Americans with Parkinson's watching the debate, and we have millions of other Americans with other diseases and families who love and adore these family members hoping that we will not take a step backward. I have faith that we will not do so.

I hope that we will vote down the Coats amendment. I hope we will continue the progress. I hope we will all continue to support the Research Freedom Act so that we can feel we did everything we could to ensure that this research is ethical.

Thank you very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, let me make two points. One is that I don't need to be reminded by the Senator from California about the ravaging effects of Parkinson's disease, having watched my grandfather suffer and die from Parkinson's, and having watched my father suffer and die from complications from Parkinson's. I am well aware of the debilitating nature of Parkinson's disease. I think many of us have had personal experiences with that. I have not mentioned that before. But I think the implication is that if one truly understood Parkinson's, you couldn't begin to support the Coats amendment. I think I truly understand Parkinson's and what it does and how it affects an individual, how it affects family and loved ones. There is the

very real possibility that it is genetically induced and that I may go through the same experience.

Second, let me just state for those who suggest that there is no hope for the millions of Parkinson's sufferers, there is great hope for the millions of Parkinson's sufferers. There is hope because, No. 1, fetal tissue research can continue if the Coats amendment is adopted. I do not deny research utilizing human fetal tissue through this amendment. I simply say that that fetal tissue cannot be obtained through induced abortions. It can be obtained through spontaneous abortions, miscarriages, or ectopic pregnancies.

But, second, there is hope because there are so many viable, wonderful alternatives that are now being researched which offer far more promise than the fetal tissue research. If you want to continue fetal research—and it probably should be continued—that fetal tissue can be obtained through sources other than human fetal tissue. In fact, it is much more promising now using animal tissue. There are a number of alternatives being explored, both through the use of cell engineering techniques, genetic engineering, and other developing cell lines.

There are also alternatives outside tissue research that hold some promise. Perhaps the recent discovery of a gene that has an effect on Parkinson's, which perhaps is the cause of Parkinson's, albeit for a percentage of people and not for all the people, offer hope. So there is great hope. There is great promise in Parkinson's research. And nothing in this amendment denies that hope, denies that promise.

So I think Members need to understand when they are voting for the Coats amendment that it is a way to preserve and continue Parkinson's research. But it is done so in a way that avoids what I think is a potential significant, ethical, and moral dilemma in terms of utilizing human fetal tissue without the consent of the person giving the tissue.

The very person who makes the decision to terminate that life is not the person who gives the consent to utilization of the tissue. That is a moral and ethical dilemma that I think is important for us to explore.

So for those two reasons, I think the Coats amendment is more than a reasonable amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before the debate goes any further, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the pending amendment at 12 noon today, and that the time between now and noon be equally divided in the usual form with no amendments in order prior to the 12 noon vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume on this issue.

Mr. President, this amendment is an attempt to revisit an issue that has been settled and should remain settled. It attempts to reverse a decision supported by both pro-choice and pro-life Senators alike. The last time this body voted on this issue, the vote was 93 to 4.

The ban on fetal tissue research was lifted 4 years ago. Since that time, the NIH has awarded over \$23 million in grants for research involving the study, analysis, and use of fetal tissue. This research holds the potential to provide tremendous advances in the treatment of debilitating conditions such as Parkinson's, diabetes, Alzheimer's, Huntington's, epilepsy, blindness, multiple sclerosis, leukemia, and a host of other illnesses.

The issue of fetal tissue research has been debated, as I said, and legislated by the Congress. The Senate voted 93 to 4 that the benefits of this research far outweigh the unsubstantiated fears and concerns that it would lead to increases in abortions.

The bill enacted in 1993 established rigorous standards to safeguard against any potential that the needs of researchers would affect individual decisions about abortion. Those safeguards are in place and they are working. In 1997, a GAO study of the safeguards reports that "the act's documentation requirements were met" and that there have been no reported violations in the acquisition of human fetal tissue for use in transplantation."

These safeguards were not written specifically to address research involving Parkinson's disease, but all research using fetal tissue. There is no need to revisit this debate as it relates to research on Parkinson's. The research being conducted today with fetal tissue is also providing new techniques such as specialized cell lines and genetically engineered cells. In fact, the development of these new technologies may well eliminate the need for using fetal tissue for research purposes in the future.

Mr. President, yesterday I received a letter from Joan Samuelson, president of the Parkinson's Action Network. It was addressed to Senator KENNEDY and others. I would like to read for the RECORD what she had to say. Her letter starts:

For decades, despite the eight-year ban on federal support for the research, significant progress has been made in the therapeutic benefit of cell transplants, including the following:

Major progress has been made in confirming the new neural cell transplant process works. In the last two years, post-mortem review of transplanted cells has proven that the transplanted cells can take hold in the host brain and produce dopamine, thereby replacing the dopamine in the body.

Major progress has been made in developing an alternative source of tissue for trans-

plantation, so that when a therapy is available to the public, it will not be dependent on elective abortions. Several alternatives are in development, including use of porcine (pig) cells, stem cells and genetically engineered cells.

The research is also providing valuable insights into the fundamental issues of Parkinson's cause. For example, the transplanted cells do not appear to be affected by the underlying disease process: While the original cells continue to degenerate, the transplanted ones do not continue to degenerate. This fact is giving essential clues into the nature of the cause and disease process.

The transplanted cells are proving more and more effective at treating Parkinson's symptoms. A few transplant patients are now off medication and symptom-free—a dramatic change.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the Samuelson letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

PARKINSON'S ACTION NETWORK,

Washington, DC, September 3, 1997.

Hon. EDWARD KENNEDY,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: For decades, despite the eight-year ban on federal support for the research, significant progress has been made in the therapeutic benefit of cell transplants, including the following:

Major progress has been made in confirming the neural cell transplant process works. In the last two years, post-mortem review of transplanted cells has proven that the transplanted cells can take hold in the host brain and produce dopamine.

Major progress has been made in developing an alternative source of tissue for transplantation, so that when a therapy is available to the public, it will not be dependent on elective abortions. Several alternatives are in development, including use of porcine (pig) cells, stem cells and genetically engineered cells.

The research is also providing valuable insights into the fundamental issues of Parkinson's cause. For example, the transplanted cells do not appear to be affected by the underlying disease process: while the original cells continue to degenerate, the transplanted ones do not. This fact is giving essential clues into the nature of the cause and disease process.

The transplanted cells are proving more and more effective at treating Parkinson's symptoms. A few transplant patients are now off medication and symptom free—a dramatic change. Although the first clinical trials are still ongoing, initial results indicate that even in these initial experimental stages the typical patient is able to reduce medication dramatically—thereby also reducing the related side effects—while also significantly lessening Parkinson's symptoms.

The Parkinson's research has created a research base which is now being used for important research using neural cell transplantation to treat many other diseases and disorders including diabetes, spinal cord injury, blindness, Huntington's disease, intractable pain, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, birth defects and Multiple Sclerosis.

Sincerely,

JOAN I. SAMUELSON, J.D.,

President.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the letter points out that we are making progress, that we are discovering new things. Now is not the time to revisit

this issue. This issue has been settled and I believe we ought to leave it alone. As we have said, the studies have shown that the safeguards we put in place are working. No violations have been encountered, and I believe the best course of action is to stay the course that we have had since 1993, and, of course, I think at the appropriate time there will be a motion made to table the Coats amendment. And I urge all Senators to support that motion to table and to continue what we have been doing since 1993 in providing for fetal tissue research but with adequate safeguards to ensure that unintended consequences do not happen because of this research.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Idaho for such time as I need.

Mr. CRAIG. No objection.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] to prohibit the use of Federal money to conduct research using fetal tissue on Parkinson's disease, fetal tissue that is produced from elective abortion. The Coats amendment exempts spontaneous abortions, exempts ectopic pregnancies. But really the thrust of his amendment is that we do not want to turn abortion clinics into mills producing tissue that is used for research.

I support his amendment. I do think it is immoral to use fetal tissue from elective abortions for medical research. I think occasionally we have to make moral statements. Do we really want to allow abortion clinics to harvest material to be used for research in whatever disease? In this case it is Parkinson's disease. Do we really want that to happen in this country?

We had a prohibition on it for years. It was not done for years. Now some people think that maybe it would be a good idea. Tissue can be harvested, can be used if the abortion is spontaneous, but not in the case of elective abortions. Do we want to have a situation where an individual goes in and kills a human being, although not yet born, maybe up into the eighth month of pregnancy, kill that unborn human being and use that human being's cells for medical research? I do not think so, and I do not think we should fund it.

The Senator from Indiana should be complimented for his amendment. I wish that this amendment was not necessary. I heard yesterday that NIH or someone has alluded to the fact that

NIH, had no objections to the amendment.

So I am maybe a little bit surprised that others are opposing this amendment as aggressively as they are. I urge my colleagues to support the Coats amendment. I think it is a good amendment. I regret that it is needed, but it is needed. I think it is important. I do not think we as a country want to have a national policy allowing abortion mills to kill unborn children and use their body parts for medical research. That is a serious issue. That is what we are voting on. So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Coats amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the bill and not have the time charged to either side on this amendment.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri such time as he requires.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the acting manager of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thought, as children are going back to school across the country and in our States, we ought to take a few moments to think about the education they are receiving and how we as parents, not just in our role as legislators, can make a real difference in how our children develop.

The truth is, we have come to know the foundations of learning begin long before a child ever gets to school. Babies from birth to age 3 years old are learning fundamental language skills at this time. Research tells us that 50 percent of a child's mature learning intelligence develops by the time that child is 3 years old. We can play a very large role in determining how successful that learning function is. We do this by reading to children even before they are old enough to hold a book. We do this by talking to them. We do this by interacting with them.

Over the August recess I traveled around the State of Missouri, focusing on the issue of literacy and working with young children who were in preschool classes or, in Missouri, in our Parents as Teachers Program. I found it to be a very exciting, a very interesting, and a rewarding experience, and one that I hope we can show—all of us, as colleagues, as others who are concerned—is a very rewarding activity for the parents.

We have always thought that early childhood was a key learning time. That is common sense. But now we

have seen it validated by science. The development of children's learning skills depends upon the child's exposure to language in the earliest years. What we do to encourage and stimulate literacy, reading ability, communicating ability, in very young children, is going to provide the basis of their success later in life.

When you come to think about it, reading is the basic skill. Learning to understand, to read and communicate is absolutely essential, particularly as we live in a complex society. Most of us think about reading and learning as part of the economic process of getting a job. I can tell you that my experiences in job training in the years when I was Governor reemphasized the importance of that. In my second term as Governor we had an on-the-job training program for industries expanding in Missouri and creating new jobs. I will never forget visiting one facility where they were installing sophisticated computer-assisted manufacturing systems. They were very complicated. You had to understand a lot of science to do the job well. And these jobs were extremely high-paying jobs. As a matter of fact, one of the workers in one of those jobs, working a 2,000-hour year, would earn more than the Governor of Missouri would have at that time. The science had all developed since I last opened a science textbook in college.

They had a 6-week training program for these workers. Four of the weeks were devoted to teaching these workers to read, because so many of them had not learned the basic reading and understanding skills in school. The prize there was demonstrable; the prize was visible. If you could read and understand, you could operate one of these machines and earn more than the Governor of Missouri was earning. And there is no question, as I talked to employers around the State, they are looking for and begging for workers. But the workers have to be able to read and understand complicated instructions, because the tasks that the workers will be called on to perform, now and in the years ahead, are rapidly changing. They are changing with technology. And the people who are doing the work have to learn to read and understand the changed instructions.

So, reading is a fundamental skill, an absolutely essential skill to get ahead economically. But we ought not to focus ourselves just on the economic side. To be an informed citizen, to participate in our democratic form of government, requires that people read, be able to understand all the messages that are coming to them. Reading provides the basis for communicating and getting along in the world in many other ways—in social activities, in community activities. So, literacy really is the fundamental basis, the foundation for knowledge and for development of well-informed, well-attuned children in our communities, in our States and in our Nation.

Former First Lady Barbara Bush has made literacy her top priority, and I take my hat off to her. I think, as I see more and more of the challenges we face in this country, the more I understand that Mrs. Bush is right. Where people do not have the fundamental reading skills, they have significant problems.

One of the reasons I have been closely associated with this literacy project is following up on the Parents as Teachers program we have in Missouri. Parents as Teachers begins by providing assistance, on a voluntary basis, to parents of children from birth to 3 years old. We have found that parents who participate in this program with their children—No. 1, are able to avoid many of the serious learning problems that affect children today and require that they be put in remedial or special education; but we are also finding that in every measure of scientific testing, these children are scoring higher than their peers. When I talk to kindergarten teachers and elementary schoolteachers and administrators, they can see the difference in these children who have worked in the program where literacy is emphasized, where parents reading to their children is emphasized.

I spent the month of August trying to encourage more and more families in Missouri—parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, caregivers—to read to their children to show that it is fun, but also to tell them that it is vitally important.

Also, we want to expand—and this bill does provide expansion of the opportunities for more States to participate in the Parents as Teachers Program. At my request, the chairman of the committee and the ranking member included \$30 million to expand Parents as Teachers programs to other States around the country and to improve on the program. Already, 47 States participate, to some degree, in the program.

Early childhood learning and development is important, and we can do a much better job. The Parents as Teachers Program is one that has had tremendous success. Mr. President, 150,000 Missouri families voluntarily participate in that program every year, and if you want to know if the program works, I can refer you to any one of those 150,000 families, because they see it is working, they know it is working, and, Mr. President, this bill provides more resources to help start these programs in every school district in the country.

I hope there will be a time when we find that families, wherever they are, who want help developing the child's learning skills will be able to get the kind of assistance that is now available in Missouri. It can make a difference, and it will make a difference in our children's education, their preparation for the work force but, most of all, their preparation to take the role in society as responsible adults, as responsible parents themselves.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting and keeping in the money for early childhood development. I hope to work with Senator KERRY and others to provide authorizing legislation in this session to expand on the opportunities to support early childhood development. Government programs are fine, but it all comes down to the responsibility of the parents, and that responsibility is very easy to outline, because the starting point is reading to children, relating to them and showing them the excitement and the wonders that are opened through reading of books and other materials.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I beg your pardon. I withdraw that.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 10 minutes off whatever time remains on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1071 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1070

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this morning, the appropriations subcommittee is having a hearing, as I understand it, to resolve the question about testing. The President has proposed a reading test that would be voluntarily made available to States and local school districts for fourth graders where the school wants to provide testing in reading, and one for eighth graders in mathematics.

There has been some controversy about this. Senator COATS from Indiana has proposed an amendment which would—the Coats amendment and the Gregg amendment together, as I understand it—essentially prohibit the use of funds to go forward with the development of these tests. I believe this would be a very grave mistake for this Congress to make if we were to prohibit the Department of Education from going forward with the development of these tests. I think the President's support on this issue has been strong. The White House has indicated that they would veto the legislation if, in fact, it did contain a prohibition on the use of funds to go ahead and develop these tests.

As I see it, the tests that the President has proposed and the Department of Education would like to develop and make available to school districts and to States is designed to allow parents, to empower parents, to understand the educational performance and the achievement level of their own children and how well the school that their child is attending is doing in preparing their child for a career later on.

The Coats amendment, as I said, would prohibit the development of the tests, and I think that would be a very serious mistake.

The problem we have today, frankly, is that every State that gives tests—

and all of our States do give tests—every State that gives tests measures by a different standard how well their students are doing. Accordingly, you have some States where most all the students do reasonably well on the test that is provided, and there is a general perception that they are going to be fine. The general trend is that everybody thinks that although the school system nationally, the educational system nationwide, is in serious difficulty, they believe that their own child is getting a good education. It just doesn't add up. Every individual child in our country cannot be getting a good education and still have the vast majority getting a less than quality education.

What we need to do is to have a system where there is agreement as to what the standard is, there is agreement as to what the test results demonstrate, and then parents can make an intelligent decision about how their child is doing relative to other children, how their child is doing, how their school that their child attends is doing relative to other schools in that same district and relative to other schools in the State or in the Nation.

We have today what is called the National Assessment for Educational Progress test, and that is a test that in 43 States tens of thousands of students participate in on a voluntary basis. This test has been in place now for 25 years. The problem, of course, is that it is not available to most students. But clearly, communities, States, and school districts recognize that it is a good, objective assessment of how the students in the schools are doing.

What we are trying to do through the development of these new tests is to take the model that the NAEP, the National Assessment for Educational Progress, has developed and, essentially, have a test that then is available for each student in each school around the country where they want to have that test administered.

I believe this is important because I believe that improvement in education in the country is going to have to be driven by concern of parents. They are the ones who need to understand the quality of the education that their children are receiving. Without something like this test available, you are not going to have the level of concern by parents that is necessary in order to ensure and require the improvements in education that I believe are needed.

Let me just indicate that there is nothing that complicated about the tests that they are talking about giving here. The reading test is a simple one. One example is they essentially go through and ask fourth graders to describe Charlotte to a friend after they read a passage from the well-known book "Charlotte's Web." That is a commonsense kind of a test that all of us would like our children to be able to pass. It is the kind of test which is appropriate to make available to all of our schools.

The same thing in math. The test there is a straightforward test. There is nothing convoluted or complicated about it. It tests basic math skills for eighth graders, and, goodness knows, everybody in this country, every parent I talked to believes their child should be prepared with a basic understanding of math by the time they complete the eighth grade.

Let me say, the business community strongly supports the President's initiative to have these tests available to States and school districts. There has been a call, a repeated call and a consistent call, by the business community to have more objective assessment going on in our schools so that we don't have so much rhetoric, but we have actual information, good solid information, about how well our students are doing.

That is exactly what employers require before they hire a person. They give them those objective tests to determine whether they have the basic skills in reading and in mathematics so that they can become productive employees. For us not to make those same kind of objective tests available in the schools before they get out into the workplace I think would be a serious mistake.

Not only does the business community support this, the public supports it. In the most recent national poll, 77 percent of the public that was questioned supported establishing national standards; 67 percent specifically supported using national tests, such as were described and supported by the President and the Department of Education.

I know that we have testimony being presented this morning. Secretary Riley is making the case before the Appropriations Committee. I hope very much that he will be persuasive to the members of that committee and that we can go forward with the funding of these tests as the administration intends.

I do think this is an issue that has great long-term consequences for our country. It would be a serious mistake for us to head this off. We already have a whole number of States—I see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor here right now. His State of Alaska has chosen to participate voluntarily in the use of these tests when they are made available. The superintendent of public instruction in my State of New Mexico has indicated his desire that we should also participate at some future date in the use of these tests. There are many States that are anxious to participate. There are many large school districts in our larger cities that have indicated the same thing.

We need to keep faith with them, go forward and develop these tests, make the tests available. If they want to use them, so much the better, that is their choice. But it would be a serious mistake for this Congress to try to make that decision for the States, make that

decision for the local school districts by denying the Department of Education the funds necessary to go ahead and develop these tests.

So I hope very much that, once the appropriations subcommittee concludes its hearing on the issue, we can proceed to dispose of this matter. I hope very much that the COATS amendment and the GREGG amendment, which is a second-degree amendment, as I understand it, or a perfecting amendment, that those amendments can be disposed of and we can proceed to pass this legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the courtesy. My understanding is we have a vote at noon; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator that the time is under the control of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Might I inquire, do we have a vote scheduled at noon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 1077

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleagues, and especially Senator COATS, for their courtesy. I was not able to come to the floor earlier, and sometimes if we feel strongly about an issue we will have a chance to speak before the vote. I thank him, and I thank Senator STEVENS and others as well.

I do not know quite where to start. Last night we passed an amendment, and this was work I was fortunate enough to get a chance to do with Senator MCCAIN, and I think we had 97 votes to expand funding for Parkinson's disease. It was an enormous victory. I believe that kind of strong vote will serve us very well in conference committee, and I believe finally we will be able to get some funding.

There has been so little funding. It has not been fair, and people who have been struggling with this disease have been here for several years now. They have become their own advocates. The only reason we had such a strong vote last night was because of their work.

My colleague, Senator COATS, was gracious enough to raise his concern through this amendment separately from that vote. He is someone here in the Senate that I believe in. I think he speaks for what he thinks is right. This amendment he introduces in very good faith.

I will be the opposite of shrill in my opposition. I think the amendment is profoundly mistaken. We have gone through this whole debate about fetal tissue research, and I again want to

make it clear that not only have we not seen one instance of abuse, not one example, but we really have very, very stringent and clear protections. A woman may not be approached for consent to donate aborted tissue. The donor may not be paid for donation of the tissue. The donor may not designate who will be the recipient of the tissue. Violations of these restrictions are a Federal felony, punishable by 10 years in Federal prison.

I say all that because I want to make it clear how strict the guidelines are. I also want to make it clear that I do not think this issue is really about using the labels pro-choice or pro-life, but it has to do with another question, which is whether or not people who are struggling with the disease are going to be able to look to a day where there will be a cure. If this amendment passes, we are essentially wiping out one very promising avenue of research. I think that would be a very crucial thing to do. That is certainly not the intention of the amendment.

I say to my colleagues, because I have been active in this work dealing with Parkinson's since I came to the Senate, I know something about it, having had two parents who struggled with Parkinson's. I know something about it, having spent a great deal of time with people in the Parkinson's community, that given the strict guidelines and given the fact that we do not see examples of abuse, and given the fact that this really is not about pro-choice and pro-life, and also given the fact that if this kind of amendment is going to be raised it ought not to be focused on one disease, I just hope that my colleagues will oppose this amendment. I think it is profoundly mistaken.

Now, Mr. President, just forget all of the statistics, except to say, and I think my colleagues will believe me, that if you talk to people in the medical research community they will tell you that fetal tissue transplant research is one of the very promising approaches. I do not think we want to "defund" that. We do not want to be in a position of, on the one hand, finding resources for research, and then essentially wiping out one of the very important modes of research to find a cure for the disease. We do not want to do that. It really undercuts part of the very important vote that took place last night.

Maybe the best way for me to summarize my view, because we will vote in just a few minutes, is to talk about a woman that some of you have come to know. Her name is Joan Samuelson. I have not asked for permission to do this, but Joan has been so visible and so vocal I do not think she will object. I first met her a number of years ago when she was testifying before our committee, the Labor and Human Resources Committee. I think she was speaking about the need to have at least a little bit more by way of resources for research, but I think she

was talking about, if my memory serves me correctly, about this fetal tissue research.

What I remember was I kept thinking about my parents. My father was almost 60 when he found out he had Parkinson's and he lived to be 84, though at the very end I will tell you, if you do not know this disease, he was so alert. He was a brilliant man. I am not objective, he was my father. He spoke 10 languages fluently but it did not help. He spoke 10 languages fluently, but because of Parkinson's he could not speak. He could not walk. And really the truth of the matter is he intensely wanted to die. That is exactly what he indicated to me.

When Joan Samuelson testified, I kept thinking, gee, she is in her thirties. What is going to be her future? If you are lucky, this disease runs a slow progression, but you never know. You do not want to find out you have Parkinson's when you are in your thirties. By the way, it is a myth that this is a disease that only afflicts the elderly.

When Joan Samuelson testified, more than anything what she was saying is, "Look, for me and many others, time is not neutral. How can you say to me that you are only willing to invest about \$30 per person for the 1 million of us who struggle with Parkinson's? How can you look at me in the eye and say that? This is my life or whether I will have a life."

The reason I raise this is I remember hearing her testify and thinking about my parents and sort of just then starting to have tears in my own eyes because I was thinking I don't want someone like Joan Samuelson to get to the place where my dad did. I don't want that to happen to her.

Now, I am not a doctor. I cannot guarantee there will be a cure to this disease tomorrow. But when I spoke to Joan Samuelson two nights ago, she is out in California, she said to me, "The way I look at this debate on fetal tissue research is this is the particular research that I think could very well lead to a cure for me." That is the point. Please, everybody, that is the point.

Whatever your position is on the general question of pro-choice, pro-life, that is not what this debate is about. To someone like Joan Samuelson, this is one avenue of research that could very well lead to a cure for this disease. That is of central importance to her. That is of central importance to the lives of many other people struggling with Parkinson's. I think that is what this vote is about.

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to please vote against this amendment. I feel like I have to, in good faith, conclude by saying, even though I hope there will be a strong vote against this amendment, one more time I want to make it crystal clear that Senator COATS is doing what he thinks is right. Senator COATS has supported this effort to expand the funding for Parkinson's. Senator COATS knows this disease all too well. I believe his

father had Parkinson's. Senator COATS, when he does something on the floor of the Senate does it because he believes in it. He does it because he thinks it is the right thing.

I deeply appreciate the support he has given Senator MCCAIN and myself on our efforts, but I think this amendment is a mistake. Actually, I want to say I know this amendment is a mistake, because I really believe it is all about someone like Joan Samuelson. We ought not to vote for the Mo Udall Parkinson's Research Act, the amendment last night introduced by Senator MCCAIN and myself, and then turn around and essentially defund one of the important avenues of research that potentially could lead to a cure for this disease. I think that would be an injustice to Joan Samuelson and many other women and men who struggle with this disease. I hope my colleagues will vote against this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the quorum be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. That vote will occur at noon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. 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. COATS. Mr. President, just in summarizing before we vote at 12 o'clock on the Coats amendment, let me just, for Members' information, clarify things here.

This amendment does not prohibit all Federal funding for fetal tissue research. Fetal tissue research can go forward. It allows fetal tissue research to go forward with tissue obtained from ectopic pregnancies and spontaneous abortions. It does prohibit Federal funds from being used for research on fetal tissue obtained by induced abortions only.

We encourage research in the most promising areas of Parkinson's disease with animal tissue transplants, gene-based therapy, deep-brain stimulation.

So this applies not to diabetes research, not to other neurological research—just to this. Other alternatives

exist. Even fetal tissue could go forward.

I hope our colleagues will understand the practical nature of this and the ethical and moral considerations of doing this, and I urge a vote in support of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Abraham	Enzi	Inhofe
Allard	Faircloth	Kempthorne
Ashcroft	Frist	Kyl
Bennett	Gorton	Lott
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Brownback	Grams	Roberts
Burns	Grassley	Santorum
Coats	Gregg	Sessions
Coverdell	Hagel	Shelby
Craig	Hatch	Smith (NH)
D'Amato	Helms	Thomas
DeWine	Hutchinson	Thompson
Domenici	Hutchison	

NAYS—60

Akaka	Ford	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Breaux	Inouye	Reed
Bryan	Jeffords	Reid
Bumpers	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Campbell	Kerrey	Roth
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kohl	Smith (OR)
Collins	Landrieu	Snowe
Conrad	Lautenberg	Specter
Daschle	Leahy	Stevens
Dodd	Levin	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lieberman	Torricelli
Durbin	Lugar	Warner
Feingold	Mack	Wellstone
Feinstein	McCain	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Chafee	Murkowski
--------	-----------

The amendment (No. 1077) was rejected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I would like to submit on this bill, but I would ask unanimous consent that I might be given an opportunity to speak to up to 10 minutes as if in morning business on a subject of some import dealing with the terrorist action today in Jerusalem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

TERRORISM IN ISRAEL

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, once again, we have seen the ugly, undeniably brutal, horrific actions of terrorism. We have seen the destructive impact of it in Jerusalem so vividly put forth over the TV screens, but it goes well beyond. We are told that 6 people died, over 150 have been injured, and obviously our sympathy goes out to them and to their families and to the people of that region who are held captive by these kinds of terrorist attacks. This is the work of Hamas, the Hamas who are given sanctuary, who operate out of the territories under the direct control of Yasser Arafat.

Now, make no mistake about it: The responsibility for this terrorist act and the previous bombings lies with Mr. Arafat. He, Mr. President, has the power to deter these murderers but does nothing. Indeed, he gives them sanctuary. He gives them sustenance. He gives them comfort.

Let me illustrate by way of this picture. It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words, and in this case I think even more so. The New York Times, Thursday, August 21, and here we see Mr. Arafat greeted by a leader of the Hamas during a meeting in Gaza: "Defying Israel, Arafat embraces Islamic militants."

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot say, on the one hand, that we are the instrumentality of peace, that we want peace, we are working for peace, and on the other hand be embracing the leaders of the terrorist organizations that are sworn to destroy Israel, the Jewish people and any prospects for peace.

That is indefensible. And so while there are those who claim that this is an internal security problem for Israel, I believe it is quite clear, given the responsibilities and given the power and given the economic wherewithal that we have provided, the United States, to Yasser Arafat, whose police force has failed, whose security services have, if anything, given sanctuary and protection to Hamas, it is about time we held him accountable for these acts. Instead of providing the security and loaning himself to the peace process, he embraces these murderers as we see so clearly. He coddles them, he provides them with sanctuary.

Mr. President, terrorism will not end if this is permitted.

I believe, and I have said before—and I see my colleague in the Chamber—that it may come time—and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] has raised this issue—for this country to look very closely at the moneys, the hundreds of millions of dollars annually that we send to Mr. Arafat under the umbrella, the cloak, of peace.

When those dollars are not being used to provide the kind of security to bring about a peace process but are aid-

ing and abetting, and, indeed, we have him embracing terrorist leaders, I think we have to at the very least look at whether this should continue. I believe that we have an obligation to speak up and say, we hold you, Mr. Arafat, responsible, and it is time to condemn him publicly for the carnage and the destruction of human life that has taken place today and in the past.

Mr. President, I see my friends and colleagues, the Senators from Connecticut and New Jersey, in the Chamber, and I know that they feel strongly about this issue.

I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank my friend and colleague from New York for yielding and for his statement.

Mr. President, as a result of a terrorist act, blood has been spilled in the streets of Israel as its citizens go about the most normal day-to-day tasks, walking, shopping. Lives again have been lost to the terrorist hand. It is a very sad and dispiriting moment, not just, of course, for those who have suffered in this terrorist attack and for the families and friends who pray now that the lives of the wounded will be saved. It is also a sad and dispiriting day for all of us who hope for the continuation of the peace process in the Middle East, begun in Oslo, ratified at a historic, dramatic, hopeful signing on the lawn of the White House on September 13, 1993 by the late Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat. The agreement, the understanding, the exchange made in the declaration of principles in the Oslo accord was complicated in one sense, but simple in another. It was an exchange in which the Israeli Government would yield land in recognition of a Palestinian self-governing authority in exchange for the Palestinians—and particularly their eventually elected leadership, Chairman Arafat and others—giving security to the people of Israel; freedom from fear of the kind of terrorist acts that have been committed again today in Israel.

Mr. President, I know the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, is controversial in many areas of this country, and there are different acts that he has carried out as a leader that some challenge and question. But it seems to me, if you look at the agreement made in the Oslo accords and you look at what was required of Israel, Prime Minister Netanyahu, since he has been Prime Minister, has kept those promises made by Prime Minister Rabin. The same cannot be said of Chairman Arafat.

It is not just, although it is significant, the failure, as promised in the Oslo accord, to remove from the Palestinian Charter these clauses which threaten the destruction of the State of Israel. It is not just, though of course it is tragic and painful, the ter-

rorist acts that continue. But it is the tone, it is the context of what is happening. The Israeli intelligence gathers evidence, presents it to Mr. Arafat to show him, a month or so ago, that the person he has appointed as the chief of the Palestinian Authority police has been involved in planning terrorist acts. How would we feel if we had evidence from intelligence showing that the minister of defense of Russia, with whom we were negotiating an arms control agreement, had been involved in planning terrorist acts against the United States? The dreadful moment, after the bombing in Israel, in Jerusalem, a few months ago, Chairman Arafat, instead of taking action to reassure the fear of average Israelis about their security, holds a conference with Hamas and other terrorist groups and embraces and kisses one of the leaders of that group. Again, the chief of police of the Palestinian Authority at one point declares with some pride that more than 100 members of Hamas are members of the Palestinian Authority police.

The effect of these actions leading, again, to this tragic terrorist act today, is not just to affect the political leadership of Israel. Israel is a democracy. That is why Mr. Netanyahu is Prime Minister. The effect of these acts that I have described is to undercut severely the trust, the confidence, the hope of the people of Israel for peace. Because they don't trust the Palestinian Authority and Mr. Arafat, based on these various acts I have described and Senator D'AMATO has described, to carry out the promises in the Oslo accords to provide security and peace.

The late Yitzhak Rabin, Prime Minister of Israel, was a great leader, a great soldier of the peace, so-called peace of the brave. But I would say today, if Prime Minister Rabin was alive and was still Prime Minister today, he could not accept the continuation of the peace process under the status quo, because the Palestinians have not kept their part of the bargain. So, I fully support the statements made by the Senator from New York. I am grateful the Secretary of State is underway to the Middle East. It will take a courageous and bold action. But the main point here is that Chairman Arafat has to understand—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The time for morning business is expired.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I ask unanimous consent I be given 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. D'AMATO. Madam President, might I ask that we have an additional—up to 15 minutes in morning business to be able to speak on this issue, because I know there are colleagues, my colleague from New Jersey and colleague from California, who would like to speak to this.