

consumers. We need to bring these savings to the American people and finally eliminate the price disparity experienced in this country by passing a strong drug reimportation law and ensuring that it is actually implemented. Please support this important legislation.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I rise to express my strong opposition to S. 3.

This Senate is poised to criminalize a medical decision made between a woman and her physician. Despite claims to the contrary, the legislation before us today will ban many abortions routinely conducted in the second trimester because the simple truth is that "partial-birth abortion" is a political term, not a medical one.

The conference report returned to us by the conferees is different from the legislation passed by the Senate back in March in one critical way—it is stripped of Senator HARKIN's amendment affirming the law of the land—Roe v. Wade. This resolution made it clear that the policy of the Senate is for abortion to be legal, safe, and rare. And the conferees stripped out this language, making it clear that their true intent is to make abortion obsolete, regardless of the effects on women.

I remain perplexed—as I was in March—that this has risen to the top of our priority list. Back in March, we were about to send our troops to battle in Iraq, we were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs a month and long-term unemployment was climbing to the highest level in decades.

Well, the more things change the more they stay the same. Long-term unemployment is now at the highest level in 20 years. The number of Americans falling into poverty has increased for 2 straight years after a decade of decline. Six hundred thousand more people are unemployed than they were in March, and we have lost more than 200 U.S. soldiers since the war began.

Yet, we have found time to ban what should be a private medical decision between a woman and her doctor.

We also have to complete the most basic work of Congress—to pass the year's spending bills. At this point, we have considered Defense, Labor, HHS, Energy, Homeland Security and the Legislative Branch. But we still have left to consider Agriculture, Commerce-Justice-State, the District of Columbia, Foreign Operations, Transportation, and VA-HUD. We should bring these bills to the floor, debate them, modify them with amendments and then send them to conference. As we get closer and closer to our target adjournment date, I have to wonder why on earth we are not going full speed ahead to bring these bills to the floor?

We also have a Medicare prescription drug bill pending in conference. This is an issue that all of us hear about every time we go home. It is one of the most important issues to the American public—and has been so for years.

With so much uncertainty here at home, the Republican leadership has made the choice to debate how best to criminalize a medical procedure for women.

I have to ask myself: Why was this moment chosen for this debate? Why aren't we debating the steps we could take to help the 8.4 million Americans who are out of work? Why aren't we debating how we can balance our Federal budget and begin to diminish these overwhelming deficits and this increasing debt load we will leave on the backs of our children? Why are we not debating the necessity of our paying our bills? Why are we not debating how to provide an affordable, meaningful prescription drug benefit for elder Americans? Why aren't we debating how to help the 34 million Americans living in poverty?

As I travel around, talking with people in my State, that is what they talk to me about: What about this war, Senator CLINTON? What about homeland security? Are we as safe as we need to be here at home? Senator, what can we do about the jobs that are disappearing in the stagnant economy? How on Earth can we deal with this overwhelming budget deficit? What about not funding No Child Left Behind and the burdens that are begin put on public education as a result? When are we going to get around to a prescription drug benefit for our seniors who are suffering and having to face these large bills? What are we doing to protect our environment? We are, after all, stewards of our natural environment for future generations.

Those are the questions I am being asked. Not the ones posed by this legislation before us today.

But nevertheless we are considering this bill and little doubt that it will be approved. So, let us be very clear on what it is we are about to pass. The way this bill is written, the choice of language eliminates the distinction of trimesters. The vagueness makes this bill applicable to many other procedures in addition to the ones explicitly named. This bill is extreme, deceptive, and unconstitutional.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania stated back in March: This is the beginning of the end. And that is absolutely what he means. If this bill passes, it is the beginning of the end of Roe v. Wade. It is the beginning of the end of the right of women in this country to make the most personal and intimate decisions that any of us would ever be called upon to make.

Why did we ever have to do Roe v. Wade to begin with? Some States like mine, let abortion, as long as it was done safely and legally, occur under certain circumstances before Roe. Why did we have to have a Supreme Court decision? We have to have it because in many parts of the country these kinds of decisions were not permitted to be made by individual women.

Look at the progress we have made. The U.S. abortion rate is now at the

lowest level it has been since 1974. When I was First Lady, I helped to launch the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. We increased education and public awareness. And since 1991, teen pregnancy has also declined. We learned that prevention and education, teaching people to make good decisions, really did work. But that is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about those few rare cases.

We are talking about those few rare cases when a doctor had to look across a desk at a woman and say, "I hate to tell you this, but the baby you wanted, the baby you care so much about, that you are carrying, has a terrible abnormality."

I have to ask myself, why do we, as government officials, expect we can make these decisions? We know that people of means will always be able to get any health care procedure they deem necessary. That is the way it was before Roe v. Wade. That is the way it will be after this passes the Senate.

We are facing a moment of historic importance, but not about what we should be debating at this time in our history. I only wish this legislation were not before us. But now that it is, we have to educate the American public.

I will end by referring again to the young woman, Mrs. Eisen, who was in my office back in March. She is about 25 years younger than I am. She said: I had no idea that the decision I made with my husband and my doctor to deal with this genetic abnormality was something I could have never had under the laws of where I lived before. And that if this passes, it will become illegal in the future.

I said: Well, you didn't have to think about that. That was something that, thankfully, we took off the national agenda. But there are those who, from very deeply held beliefs, which I respect, would wish to substitute the Government's decision for what should be a difficult, painful, intimate, personal decision.

This bill is not only ill-advised, it is also unconstitutional. I understand what the other side wants to do. They are hoping to get somebody new on the Supreme Court and to turn the clock back completely, to overrule Roe v. Wade.

Is this bill really about what the sponsors say, or is it, as they candidly admit, the beginning of the end—to go back in this country to back-alley abortions, to women dying from botched, illegal procedures? I think you can draw your own conclusions.

It is up to the American public to determine whether they want medical decisions being criminalized by this Senate.

---

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

---

##### TRIBUTE TO JIM REITER

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I was back home in St. Paul a couple weeks

ago during our last recess, and on late Tuesday afternoon of that week, I met with my friend Randy Kelly, mayor of St. Paul.

Since I used to call his office my own, I look forward to these meetings. They give me the chance to get a firsthand update of the city. As my colleagues here in the Senate who also used to be in a mayor's office would attest, once you leave it's hard to not think and care about what you used to pay attention to so closely. A former mayor will always have an interest in the affairs and goings-on of his city.

On that note, the meeting I had with Mayor Kelly immediately began with what was to us a situation of great sadness for the city of St. Paul—the passing of Jim Reiter earlier that afternoon, a friend of ours and member of St. Paul's city council.

As you can imagine, this is unfortunate news to come home to. But during times like this, I think home is the best place for a person to be, surrounded by those who understand what it is like to lose the friend we all had in Jim.

Being with my family and reflecting with others on Jim's time and accomplishments at the council were consoling, as was reading the Twin Cities' newspapers the next two mornings and seeing their fitting recognition of Jim as a caring family man and dedicated servant to the people of St. Paul's North End and Como Park neighborhoods.

The papers reported that Jim "represented" these people at the city level, and that is true. But because I believe he did more than just represent the residents of these neighborhoods, I would use a different phrase to describe his efforts. I would say that Jim "took care of" these people.

For neighborhoods, he knew what was important, and that includes having both a sense of pride in where you live and a sense of safety. As a result, he saw to it that the housing conditions of his neighborhoods improved and that his residents had what all should—a library and a community center. He also made it a point to have police officers regularly patrolling the streets, and if they weren't present, Jim would take matters into his own hands by driving around in his "Crime Watch" car, a surplus police cruiser he bought with his city council car allowance.

Jim and I shared the same vision for St. Paul, and I couldn't have done what I did during my eight years as mayor without him. Jim understood my priorities to make St. Paul an even better place to live and work, and he made sure his ward measured up.

Not only has St. Paul's North End, Como Park area, and city council experienced a loss after Jim's passing, but so has the city as a whole, which was noticeable the next day when I went to a field hearing and saw flags lowered at half-staff throughout the city.

More importantly, he was my friend. I will miss his smile. I will miss his

humor. I will miss his independent speech. I will miss him.

Finally, my thoughts are with Jim's family: his wife Darlene; son Jim Jr.; daughters Linda, Debby, Jean, and Kris; and his four grandchildren. Their husband, father, and grandfather was a true civic leader and a great friend that I—and I know many others—will never forget.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was referred by unanimous consent, as follows:

S. 1781. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations for the reimportation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1781. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations for the reimportation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the number of years during which the death tax under subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed should be extended, pending the permanent repeal of the death tax.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. LOTT):

S. 1785. A bill to authorize the operation of National Guard counterdrug schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KYL:

S.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the number of years during which the death tax under subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is repealed should be extended, pending the

permanent repeal of the death tax; read the first time.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 150

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to make permanent the moratorium on taxes on Internet access and multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce imposed by the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 423

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to promote health care coverage parity for individuals participating in legal recreational activities or legal transportation activities.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to reauthorize and improve that Act.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for premiums on mortgage insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1000

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 1000, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service; to provide TRICARE eligibility for members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve and their families; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserve components and to allow a comparable credit for participating reserve component self-employed individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1180

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1180, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit and the welfare-to-work credit.

S. 1684

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1684, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require