

The problem with this bill, it bans procedures—and maybe all procedures—many procedures, except some that are very dangerous to a woman, and procedures that could be used at any stage of abortion. That is what the court said, and it makes no exception for her health. I argue the life exception is very narrowly drawn, but we don't have time to go into that tonight.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I reiterate the fact that this is not an issue that gets to the basis of the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. I predict that just as in the past on the floor of the Senate, there are going to be people supporting the outlaw of this gruesome procedure, which is not necessary, who are very much pro-choice, pro-abortion, and who will probably have amendments on the floor of the Senate, a sense of the Senate, in terms of *Roe v. Wade* and many of the people who will vote to sustain *Roe v. Wade* will be some of the same people who will vote against this procedure because they understand how gruesome it is.

I point out one other fact. You just cannot give the back of the hand statistics from the Alan Guttmacher Institute, which is a very respected institute, which is an affiliate of Planned Parenthood, that published a survey of abortion providers showing—these are abortion providers, OK—showing that the number of partial-birth abortions more than tripled between 1996 and 2000.

So this procedure is not one that is being practiced in some of the examples that my colleague from California has presented on the floor of the Senate but, rather, has become a regular procedure in the offices of many OB/GYN doctors in this country—a procedure that is not necessary.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this much-needed and long-overdue measure. There is no place in a decent Nation for the barbaric practice known as partial-birth abortion. Senator SANTORUM's measure is the only one the Senate is considering that will put an end to it once and for all.

Every abortion ends the life of a tiny boy or girl, but only partial-birth abortion involves the destruction of life at the moment when a child is being brought out of the womb—and he or she is just inches from under the full protection of our laws. Partial-birth abortion blurs the line and does so in such a way as to further erode the sanctity of life.

The legislation Senator SANTORUM has proposed should avoid the constitutional problems that five Supreme Court Justices found in Nebraska's statute in the *Stenberg v. Carhart* case. Specifically, it addresses the concern that the partial-birth abortion

procedure might be necessary to protect the health of the mother by incorporating as findings the view of the American Medical Association and the overwhelming majority of physicians that there is no circumstance where the health of the mother demands this procedure. It also contains a more specific definition of the partial-birth abortion procedure, in response to the Stenberg decision.

This revised definition ensures that, once we pass this bill, it will no longer be permissible in America to—and here I quote the language of the bill itself—“deliberately and intentionally vaginally deliver a living fetus until, the entire fetal head is outside the body of the mother and then kill the baby as happens in a typical partial-birth abortion.”

There is no doubt, in contrast, that the substitute measures that the Senate is considering will permit the continued use of this unconscionable procedure. To secure the approval of the radical, pro-abortion lobby, the authors of such measures inevitably draft their so-called “bans” in such a way as to permit “health of the mother” exceptions that effectively negate the restrictions. Again, the testimony of the mainstream medical community makes it clear that “health of the mother” is a red herring in the partial-birth abortion context, and I trust that any measure containing such an “exception” will be soundly defeated.

It is simply not possible to seek cover politically while substantively protecting the most unscrupulous abortionists. The American people overwhelmingly favor enactment of a real partial-birth abortion ban. Despite the predictable efforts to obscure what is really a very clear issue—how we wish to treat the most vulnerable members of our human family—they will soon have it.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

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

THE PROSPECT OF WAR AGAINST IRAQ AND SUPPORTING OUR ARMED FORCES

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to speak about some of the most crucial issues facing our Nation: No. 1, the prospect of war against Iraq, and, No. 2—though it will never be in second place—support for our U.S. military.

It has been my longstanding position to support a multinational response to the Iraqi threat. That means building international support to defang Saddam Hussein. We all know he is a duplicitous character, but I believe if the goals of America and the world are to be successful, we need to work in a

multilateral way, working through the United Nations, to build international legitimacy, and also to get the world to support us, to share the burden of war, if war is necessary, during the war in terms of the danger, and to share the burden of what would come after the war in terms of the economic cost of rebuilding Iraq.

The risks and consequences of acting alone are much greater than they would be for multinational action. The risks to our troops are greater. If allied forces do not join the mission, our troops will be bearing that burden all by themselves. The challenge in post-conflict Iraq will be greater if other nations do not share this responsibility or this burden. Also, I believe the consequences for the war on terrorism will be greater if we lose the essential cooperation of other nations.

There is a lot of disagreement about going to war: whether we should go to war now; whether we should go to war at all; whether we should go to war alone or whether we should continue to work through the United Nations. I have stated my own positions. But I believe there is something all Americans agree on; that is, we must support our troops. We must stand up for those who are standing up for us. We must protect our defenders, the brave men and women of our military, and we must support them not only with words but with deeds. That means ensuring that our troops have the best and smartest weapons, that they have the training and the equipment they need.

But while we are standing up for our military, we must also stand up for their families. Our troops will face grave danger. They should not have to face fear for their families, and particularly they should not have to worry about their families' finances.

Although America is on the brink of war, American military families must never be on the brink of bankruptcy. That is why we, in the Senate, must take immediate steps to support military families.

There is legislation pending. Let's provide tax relief to military families. Let's pass legislation to help the families of the National Guard and the Reserves who have been called up for longer periods than at any time in the past 40 years.

Each and every member of our military is part of the American family. Their service is a tremendous sacrifice and great risk. These are ordinary men and women called upon to act in an extraordinary way. Whatever their Nation asks them to do, I know they will do it with bravery, fortitude, and gallantry. All Americans owe them a debt of gratitude.

Members of the military, though, do not just need our gratitude through words; they need our gratitude through deeds. That is why I support two immediate steps and call upon the Senate to join with me and other like-minded colleagues to advance these steps.

I believe the Senate must quickly pass legislation to ease the tax burden