

(b) GAO STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of potential improvements to Civil Air Patrol operations, including Civil Air Patrol financial management, Air Force and Civil Air Patrol oversight, and the Civil Air Patrol safety program. Not later than February 15, 2000, the Inspector General shall submit a report on the results of the study to the congressional defense committees.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—(1) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall review the financial and management operations of the Civil Air Patrol. The review shall include an audit.

(2) Not later than February 15, 2000, the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the review, including, specifically, the results of the audit. The report shall include any recommendations that the Inspector General considers appropriate regarding actions necessary to ensure the proper oversight of the financial and management operations of the Civil Air Patrol.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask for an hour equally divided.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. I thank the Chair for the guidance. I thought the amendment had been logged in.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the Senator from Virginia would consider the following approach: after the disposition of the Murray amendment, that there then be an hour of debate on the Kerrey amendment and, immediately following the disposition of the Kerrey amendment, that the reconsideration vote occur on the Gramm amendment, precluding second-degree amendments to the Kerrey amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will have to ask my colleague to withhold that request. I will work on it, and I think we can accommodate all interested parties.

Now, my understanding from the Chair is, we proceed to the amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has a unanimous consent request pending. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. I am not able to hear the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia had a unanimous consent request pending. Is the Senator withdrawing that request?

Mr. WARNER. No. I thought I had a unanimous consent request to proceed to the amendment of the Senator from Washington for a period not to exceed 1 hour, at the conclusion of which there would be a motion to table and then, of course, a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, all I want to do is work out a time to bring up a vote that we are not even going to debate on. I will be happy to have it either after the Kerrey amendment or at 5 o'clock. There is some concern here

about limiting a second amendment, apparently, on the Kerrey amendment. I do not have a dog in that fight.

We are in a position where I can't exercise my right, because we have two amendments, now three amendments, that are pending, which makes the floor manager sort of a gatekeeper. But it also makes anyone else a gatekeeper. All I am asking is if I could get an agreement on a time certain basis and/or following something else. I am not trying to be difficult to deal with; I just would like to work this out before we go on.

If 5 o'clock is all right, we can stop whatever we are doing at that point and have the vote. I do not even require any more debate. I just want to settle this issue. I would have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor. There is a unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, so the floor managers may have the opportunity to have the consent request, would the Chair repeat the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think I can clarify the situation very quickly.

The Senator from Virginia has prodded a UC to permit the Senator from Washington to have an hour equally divided, after which time there will be a tabling motion by the Senator from New Hampshire and then a vote.

That was before the Chair at the time our colleague from Texas sought recognition for the purpose of trying to reconcile an understanding between himself and the ranking member. Apparently, at this time, we cannot achieve that reconciliation. It is my hope that the two Senators can continue to work and will permit the Senate to go forward with the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, may I just suggest that we set the vote at 5 o'clock and leave the Kerrey amendment alone? The net result is the same. The Senator was willing to agree a moment ago to do it. If the Kerrey amendment is what is in dispute, it seems that it would have produced this result before. So I just urge my friend from Michigan to allow us to settle the issue. We are going to do it without intervening debate. But the problem is that I have privilege under the rules of the Senate, and that is being precluded by the stacking of amendments that require a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WARNER. I think we are ready to solve it. Would the Senator have a colloquy with our colleague?

Mr. GRAMM. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, my understanding is that the chairman has no objection if at 5 o'clock we have the vote on reconsideration, even though we were in the middle of another debate. I have no objection if he doesn't.

Mr. WARNER. I have no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. That is probably what will happen. In the middle of debate on another amendment, we will go back to the reconsideration. I have no objection to that happening at 5 o'clock.

Mr. WARNER. We have done that before. It may be somewhat inconvenient, but it is important to keep the momentum of this bill going. We have had superb cooperation from all Senators. I would like to make note that we have only had two quorum calls in 3 days.

Mr. President, I now propound a unanimous consent request that the Senator from Washington be permitted to go forward with her amendment at this time, with a 1-hour time agreement, equally divided between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire, and at the conclusion of that hour, there be a motion to table by the Senator from New Hampshire and then a rollcall vote. We will get the yeas and nays later.

Mr. GRAMM. We have the 5 o'clock vote on the reconsideration, correct?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I add to that a 5 o'clock vote on amendment No. 392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I do not have an objection, but I would like to make an inquiry. At some point, I would like to be in a position to do what Senator ALLARD has done, which is to introduce an amendment and then lay it aside for the appropriate consideration at its due time. Would it be appropriate, after we have taken action on the unanimous consent, or as part of the unanimous consent, that I would be given an opportunity to introduce an amendment and then lay it aside?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I just ask if we could have one variation. At the conclusion of the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Washington, I would be prepared to work out an opportunity for the Senator from Florida to be recognized and lay down an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Virginia?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the adjournment resolution, which is at the desk, and further that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 27, 1999, on a motion

offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 7, 1999, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 27, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, June 7, 1999, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of the concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 397

(Purpose: To repeal the restriction on use of Department of Defense facilities for privately funded abortions)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. KERREY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 397.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

In title VII, at the end of subtitle B, add the following:

SEC. 717. RESTORATION OF PREVIOUS POLICY REGARDING RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES.

Section 1093 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.”.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is the Murray-Snowe amendment that concerns our brave young women who serve in the military and their right to pay for their own safe, reproductive health care services. I am here today, again joined by Senator SNOWE and many others, to offer our amendment to protect military personnel and their dependents' access to safe, affordable, and legal reproductive health care services.

That is exactly what this amendment is all about—access to safe, affordable, and legal reproductive health care

services. That is why the Department of Defense supports this amendment, as does the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. The Department of Defense recognizes that it has a responsibility to ensure the safety of all of its troops, including our women.

Many of you may wonder why Senator SNOWE and I continue to offer this amendment year after year. Why don't we just give up? Let me tell my colleagues, the reason I come to the floor every year during the Department of Defense authorization bill is to continue to educate in the hope that a majority of you will finally stand up for all military personnel.

As I have in the past, I come here today to urge my colleagues to guarantee to all military personnel and their dependents the same rights and guarantees that are enjoyed by all American citizens. These rights should not stop at our border. We should not ask military service women to surrender their rights to safe, affordable, legal reproductive health care services because they have made a commitment to serve our country.

Many of our military personnel serve in hostile areas in countries that do not provide safe and legal abortion services. Military personnel and their families should not be forced to seek back-alley abortions, or abortions in facilities that do not meet the same standards that we expect and demand in this country. In many countries, women who seek abortions do so at great risk of harm. It is a terrifying process.

I heard from a service woman in Japan who was forced to go off base to seek a legal abortion. Unfortunately, there was no guarantee of the quality of care, and the language barrier placed her at great risk. She had no way of understanding questions that were asked of her, and she had no way of communicating her questions or concerns during the procedure. Is that the kind of care that we want our service personnel to receive? Don't they deserve better? I am convinced that they do.

This amendment is not—let me repeat it is not—about Federal funding of abortions. The woman herself would be responsible for the cost of her care, not the taxpayer. This amendment simply allows women who are in our services to use existing military facilities that exist already to provide health care to active-duty personnel and their families. These clinics and hospitals are already functioning. There would be no added burden.

I also want to point out that this amendment would not change the current conscience clause for medical personnel. Health care professionals who object to providing safe and legal health care services to women could still refuse to perform them. Nobody in the military would be forced to perform any procedure he or she objects to as a matter of conscience.

For those of you who are concerned about Federal funding, I argue that

current practice and policy results in more direct expenditures of Federal funds than simply allowing a woman herself to pay for the cost of this service at the closest medical military facility.

Today, when a woman in the military needs an abortion or wants an abortion, she first has to approach her duty officer to request from him or her medical leave. Then she has to ask for transport to a U.S. base with access to legal abortion-related services. Her duty officer has to grant the request, remove her from active duty, and transport her to the United States. This is an expensive, taxpayer-funded, and inefficient system. Not only is there cost of transportation, but there is cost to military readiness when active personnel is removed for an extended period of time.

As we all know, women are no longer simply support staff in the military. Women command troops and are in key military readiness positions. Their contributions are beyond dispute. While women serve side by side with their male counterparts, they are subjected to archaic and mean-spirited health care restrictions. Women in the military deserve our respect and they deserve better treatment.

In addition to the cost and the loss of personnel, we have to ask: What is the impact on the woman's health? A woman who is stationed overseas can be forced to delay the procedure for several weeks until she can get her travel to the United States where she can get safe, adequate, legal health care. For many women, every week an abortion is delayed is a risk to her health.

Why should a woman who is serving our country in the military be placed at a greater risk than a woman who is not serving in the military?

In talking about this amendment, I am often struck by how little some of my colleagues know about restrictions on reproductive health care services in many other countries. Many of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that in some countries abortions are illegal, and punishment is swift and brutal—not just against the provider but against the woman as well. In these cases, a back-alley abortion can be deadly. Not only are they risking their own health, but they are also risking their own safety and well-being.

We are talking about women who are serving us overseas in the military. Why should we put our military personnel in this kind of danger?

We are fortunate in this country, because abortion is an extremely safe procedure when it is performed by trained medical professionals. However, in the hands of untrained medical professionals in unsterilized facilities abortion can be dangerous and risky to a woman's health. The care that we expect—actually the care that we demand—is simply not universal.

Regardless of what some of my colleagues may think about the constitutional ruling that guarantees a woman