On MILCON, I am prepared to move on that conference report. If the minority whip is willing, I am prepared to lock in a 20-minute time agreement to allow the managers to make short statements and then to allow us to finish that measure. I ask the Democratic whip if he would allow us to proceed to that when we proceed to the conference report, that it be considered, and that a short time agreement be part of that agreement.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I ask that the consent be modified to allow the statements to be made after the bill passes today. We would pass it today, and people could have more than 20 minutes next week to speak on it all they want. This matter should be passed immediately.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I renew my request as made because it is very important that people who have worked very hard on MILCON, out of respect for them and those managers, be here and they make the appropriate speeches and response in support of this bill.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, does the leader have the time in mind when he would bring this up?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we would bring it up the early part of next week.

Mr. REID. As I have indicated, I want it passed tonight. People in Nellis Air Force Base and Fallon can do without speeches. It should be passed now. If it will not be passed now, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as you can tell, we have a very busy week next week. I will comment a little bit more on the schedule shortly and we will be doing MILCON and Syria as well as many other things over the next several days.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to discuss something that struck me as downright chilling when I saw it yesterday in the paper. It was the signing of the so-called partial-birth abortion bill. I want to show a picture as it appeared—as I first saw it in the Washington Post. I challenge anybody: Find a woman in that picture. We even broadened it to a larger picture, and once again I issue the challenge: Find a woman in this picture. There are 10 men, not 1 woman in that picture.

This picture represents the most sweeping attack on women's rights in 30 years. What do we see? We see a group of gleeful men, smiles across their faces. We don't see the picture of the women who are frightened to death about what can happen if they need to make a decision to protect their health, in the company of their doctor.

This gleeful group is watching President Bush sign away women's rights. Look at the image—not a woman on the stage. Does anybody doubt about how the population splits 50–50 between the two genders? But here, in these two pictures, it is all men, and it is downright frightening.

It has been said that a picture is worth a thousand words. When women across America picked up the paper or watched the news and saw this image, it spoke volumes. This photo says to women: Your right to make choices about your health and your body is being taken back from you.

I am the proud father of three daughters and five granddaughters. I don't want the men in these pictures making decisions for my daughters or my granddaughters when it comes to their health and their well being and their families' well-being. Thank goodness, all of my children have children. They have wonderful families. But they have to take care of those families. If their health is jeopardized by a pregnancy or a disease, I want them to be able to take care of it.

Not here. These men will make your choices for you.

I am old enough to remember a time when women were not permitted to make choices, when women couldn't hold certain positions in society. There was a time when women couldn't vote. We have made great strides forward to advance women's rights, and one of those rights is the right to choose. But look at this picture. These fellows are eager to snatch those rights away from women.

The absence of women on the stage says something. Make no mistake. We have more than a dozen women in the Senate. I don't know what the count is in the House. Not one of them stood on this floor during the debate and defended that law that was passed and signed so smugly at the White House. I call this a ''malegarchy'' and this photo captures the essence of the ''malegarchy'' women live under today.

If we keep going backwards, maybe it will be possible our women will live like they do in parts of the Middle East and have to wear burqas. The men will decide.

I think it is shameful. It is embarrassing to see this image in the 21st century in the United States of America. Have we entered a time warp? In some ways we have. Ultra right-wing conservatives who control this Congress and control the White House are more in line with the thinking of the 19th century than the 21st century.

The conservatives today speak of ''traditional family values'' and protecting marriage. Those are their buzz phrases, but you look back in history and what you see here is a repeat of the same themes constantly used to keep women subservient. I couldn't get away with that in my household.

In 1914, during the battle over the women's right to vote, there was a group called the Nebraska Men's Association Opposed to Women's Suffrage—that was the title of the organization. It was organized in 1914. The group published a document expressing its reasons for opposing women's suffrage. The association claimed if we give women the ability to vote, to make electoral choices, then that would lead to ''attempts to change home and marriage.'' Does that sound familiar? It is the same rhetoric we hear today. In this picture, it is the same rhetoric being used at this bill signing.

We also hear about the ''culture of life.'' What about the woman's life? What about her health? This law does not include a health exception. What if a woman's health is in danger? What if her life is ultimately threatened by complications stemming from the pregnancy? And where is the culture of life when that fetus is born? Where is the culture of life for children who have been born?

Earlier in this Congress, the anti-choice conservatives led the fight against the child tax credit for low-income working families. Where are the family values in that? Where is the culture of life in that?

How about nutrition for those children? How about education for those children? How about health care for those children?

We have seen ''no'' vote after ''no'' vote on funding these programs for making our children healthier and brighter and more productive.

I was pleased to see the Federal courts in Nebraska and New York issue injunctions against this unconstitutional abortion law. The vast majority of legal scholars predict this law will be easily overturned, based on Roe v. Wade, and it should.

The famed American suffragette Elizabeth Cady Stanton said ''men want their rights and nothing more, but women want their rights and nothing less.'' As we can see with the signing of this bill, women's rights are still under attack. We must not settle for anything less than full reproductive rights for women in America.

CONGRESSIONAL PORK

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to address an article that appeared on the front page of Roll Call on Thursday, November 8. The title of the article was ''McCain Breaks Own Pork Rule,'' and it addressed my efforts, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, to secure authorized funding—I emphasize authorized—for land acquisition at Luke Air Force Base in Arizona. Sadly, the headline was misleading and the article itself was simply inaccurate.

As my colleagues know—and I see my colleague from West Virginia in the Chamber—for many years I have made it a point to carefully scrutinize the annual appropriations bills which are, in my view, wasteful porkbarrel spending. I have specific criteria for identifying these projects which are very clear. Simply put: If an item is requested by the administration or properly authorized, I do not object to it and I do not consider it a porkbarrel project. Having said that, let me address the situation discussed in the Roll Call article.