every locality—every county and city—to determine how to spend locally-raised revenue.

I know why the District is being targeted in this way. And so does every woman, and so should every American. This is just another of the many attempts by some Members of Congress to chip away and take away a woman's right to choose.

It sure is ironic. That in this Congress, where the mantra has been ''States know best'' month after month, the majority party now wants to micro manage DC's financial decisions.

Mr. President, restricting the ability of the District to determine how it is going to spend its locally raised revenue is the ''Congress knows best'' approach at its worst. I find it so very hypocritical that virtually every debate over the past year has touted local flexibility and vilified Washington, DC's presence in policy making.

We should allow the District the same right as all other localities—to choose how to use their locally raised revenue. We should not single out our Nation's capital. We should pass the Boxer amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator the time will be charged to the Senator unless she asks unanimous consent that her remaining time be reserved.

Mrs. BOXER. I make a unanimous-consent request that my remaining time be reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes 6 seconds remaining, and that time will be reserved.

The quorum call will be charged to no one at this particular point.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition for a few moments this morning to speak in morning business for a period not to exceed 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to do that.

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

The Senator is recognized to speak up to 5 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I have been asked to take a limited leadership role here.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITHIN ADMIRALTY ISLAND NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 213, H.R. 1266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1266) to provide for the exchange of lands within Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to join with the senior Senator from Alaska to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1266.

This bill ratifies a land exchange agreement in Alaska between the Forest Service and the Kennecott Greens Creek Mining Co. The agreement will help provide 300 jobs in Alaska, promote sound economic and environmentally responsible resource development, and further the interest of land consolidation on conservation systems in the Tongass National Forest.

Mr. President, this bill has bipartisan support. Chairman DON YOUNG was the author of the bill in the House and as a result of his efforts, the bill passed the House of Representatives with support from the ranking member of the Resource Committee. Chairman DON YOUNG deserves credit for his hard work on this bill.

In the Senate, the Greens Creek Land Exchange was reported out the Energy and Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent. The bill is supported by the Forest Service and local environmental organizations.

Mr. President, let me explain the history of the Greens Creek Mine and this agreement. The Greens Creek Mine was located under the mining laws while the area was still part of the general National Forest area. As you may know, in 1980 the area became part of the Admiralty Island National Monument through the enactment of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act [ANILCA]. Because this mine had world-class potential, Congress made special provisions in the act to ensure that the mine could go forward.

I was pleased to participate in the opening ceremonies of the Greens Creek Mine. The mine provided high-paying jobs to Juneau residents and supported the local economy. Unfortunately, low metal prices caused the temporary closure of the mine in April 1993. Kennecott worked diligently to reorient its mining development plan to permit the mine to reopen. In fact, they recently announced plans to reopen the mine during the next several months.

Mr. President, this land exchange is the combination is a 10-year effort by Kennecott to deal with one of the problems created by the special management regime in ANILCA. Although that regime permitted the perfection and patenting of certain claims, it did not provide an adequate time for exploration of all the area of mineral potential surrounding the Greems Creek Mine.

Since Kennecott determined that it would be unable to fully explore all the areas of interest during the 5-year time period it was allowed to provide exploration under ANILCA, it has been searching for a way to explore these areas.

They have engaged in a multiyear negotiation with the Forest Service to develop a land exchange which would permit access to the area in a manner which is compatible with the monument designation provided by Congress in 1980.

In other words, the land exchange allows exploration under strict environmental regulations. The terms of the exchange require Kennecott to utilize its existing facilities to the maximum extend possible to ensure minimal changes to the existing footprint.

Additionally, the development of any areas once explored would be under the same management regime by which Kennecott developed the existing Greens Creek Mine.

This land exchange also provides other major benefits to the Government, the community, and the environment.

At the end of mining, Kennecott will revert its existing patented claims and any other claims which it holds on Admiralty Island to the Federal Government.

Kennecott will also fund the acquisition of over 1 million dollars' worth of inholdings in the Admiralty Island National Monument and other conservation system units in the Tongass.

Finally, the exchange improves the likelihood that 300 jobs will return to the Juneau area for many years to come.

Mr. President, the Greens Creek Land Exchange is good policy. I congratulate Kennecott and the Forest Service for negotiating a fair agreement and urge the President to sign the bill as soon as possible.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (H.R. 1266) was considered and passed.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I make the request of the clerk, who is asking me to do that on behalf of leadership, to discount any personalized knowledge as to the complexities which we have ruled upon.

I have been asked to further make this request for unanimous consent.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor

Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1787, and, further, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1787) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to repeal the Saccharin notice requirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Again, I make a disclaimer, Mr. President, that I am making this statement at the request of the clerk in the absence of leadership where more detailed knowledge is present as to the specifics involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator's reservation is duly noted.

So the bill (H.R. 1787) was considered and passed.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

In the absence of any other Senator on the floor, 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. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand the time is controlled. I yield myself 12 minutes from Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 5 minutes remaining. Senator MURRAY has 7½, and Senator FEINSTEIN has 7½.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 3 minutes, Mr. President.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3508

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, very briefly, there are two major proposals before the Senate this afternoon. One proposal prohibits the District of Columbia from using locally raised funds to provide abortions for its residents. It allows the Congress of the United States to undermine the constitutional rights of poor women and thus, their ability to receive an abortion.

We do not interfere with the disbursement of local funds in any of the States because it is inappropriate to dictate State and local policy in this area. It is equally inappropriate to impose the will of the Federal Government on the District of Columbia. This is the long arm of the Federal Government reaching in and dictating the health conditions for needy women in the District. Many of these women have determined that they must have an abortion but, because they are poor, they need assistance from the District of Columbia. District of Columbia elected officials should have the ability to allocate funds to women in these circumstances.

Second, I reject the belief that the Senate should determine medical residency training criteria as it pertains to issues regarding women. This is the first real attempt to superimpose Congress' view on obstetric and gynecological medical training. Today, we are saying we will not require that medical training institutions provide abortion training for ob/gyn residents. Tomorrow, we may be making policy and setting standards in another area of medical training. Congress should leave the practice of medicine to the doctors. In this case, a highly respected board is attempting to insure that we have the best-trained physicians in the world. We have already acceded to a conscience clause that protects religious and moral beliefs of institutions and residents. Those individuals and institutions will not be required to participate in certain medical procedures that violate their conscience or their religious training. But to go beyond that by passing a law that substitutes congressional and political opinion for medical decisionmaking is wrong. Congress should not interfere with current ACGME policy. It is an inappropriate use of our authority. It is bad policy and it is bad medicine. We should reject this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield whatever time remains.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield myself 1 minute just to say to the Senator from Massachusetts how grateful I am that he expressed his views on the floor. This has been a very difficult morning because there was a modified amendment which, unfortunately, I could not get to analyze until this morning. And the Senator is right. We already have a conscience clause. Any institution who has a moral or religious objection to teaching abortion is covered under current law, and what this would say is that any institution, even if they did not have a moral or religious objection, would not have to teach residents how to perform safe, competent abortions so that our women are safe.

On the matter of Washington, DC, I wish to tell the Senator that there are 3,049 counties, 19,100 cities, and every one of them has the right to spend their locally raised funds as they wish. To pick out one entity and reach the long arm of the Federal Government into it is really unfair and goes against the supposed spirit of this Republican Congress. So I thank my friend very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used her 1 minute.

Who yields time?

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 30 minutes allocated to her under the previous order.

AMENDMENT NO. 3513, AS MODIFIED

Ms. SNOWE. I will consume as much time as I require. I thank the Chair.

I rise today to join the distinguished Senator from Indiana in offering an amendment that I think will address many concerns. In fact, I am pleased to have the opportunity to clarify some of the misinformation that has been expressed regarding this compromise amendment.

No one can question whether or not it is appropriate to ensure quality care for women in America. No one can question that we need to maintain accreditation standards for medical institutions across this country. The fact remains that this amendment on which I worked in conjunction with the Senator from Indiana does not allow Federal funds to go to an unaccredited institution because they fail to provide for abortion training.

Nothing could be further from the truth. This amendment accomplishes two things. One, it does protect those institutions and those individuals who do not want to get involved in the performance or training of abortion when it is contrary to their beliefs. Second, and just as important, it preserves the quality of health care that will be provided to women because it protects the universally accepted standards—there is only one set of standards—of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education that provides for quality standards for ob-gyn programs. So this amendment would not only make sure that women have access to quality health care with the strictest of standards when it comes to quality and safety but it also will ensure that they have access to physicians who specialize in women's health care.

I do not think anybody would disagree with the fact—and I am prochoice on this matter, but I do not think anybody would disagree with the fact that an institution or an individual who does not want to perform an abortion should do so contrary to their beliefs. But at the same time we have to make sure we preserve the accreditation standards that are established by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, that provides for the standards for more than 7,400 medical institutions in America.