

the womb—it can't scream—it has a silent scream, nonetheless it is showing all the time the physiological nature of going through excruciating pain.

I have another chart to put up here to illustrate this point as well. This is from the same physician. Dr. Annand says:

The fetuses show increased heart rate, blood flow and hormone level in response to pain.

This is how you and I, adults, respond to pain, although the difference for us is we have less pain receptors per square inch, and we also have developed a part of the brain that holds down or suppresses pain. So actually we feel less pain because of the way our brain is further developed. But the child feels more pain.

This issue is something I think most of us would probably choose to ignore, if we could, and say "let's just not talk about it." But when this is going on and you know about it, how can you ignore it? It would be like us saying, about some of the tragedies in our history, I just do not want to know about it. Just do not tell me about it. I would rather be ignorant. Yet today we cannot deny the scientific information.

Here is a picture of a child in the womb. I do not know the age of this child. But can you deny the humanity of this child?

I have a coin given to me yesterday from a Croatian, a gentleman from Croatia that I want to show you has the same picture of this unborn child imprinted on this coin minted in Croatia. They just ask basically on the coin, as you can in the picture, how can you deny the humanity of this child? If that is the case—and if you dismember this child in a late-term abortion, how can you deny the humanity of this child and the pain it experiences? We know physiologically because of the scientific advances taking place what this child experiences. How can you ignore scientific evidence and say it is simply not taking place, or I just do not want to see it, which was unfortunately typically done too often in our past. But the facts seem too horrific for us to look at. We have seen recently in places around the world the horrific suffering. Many times we just want to say: Don't show it to me. I don't really want to see it. Yet it can't be denied. It must be confronted. The sooner it is talked about, the sooner it will be addressed.

Let us have a lively debate. If people don't believe the child is experiencing pain, come forward with the scientific information. It would be counter to all common experience of women in pregnancy at that 20-week stage or later. It would be counter to all the current scientific information. Bring it forward. Let us have a lively debate about this. This bill does not ban any abortion procedure. It simply is an informed consent bill that women deserve to know about.

It is my hope that once a woman receives this information she would de-

cide to go ahead with the pregnancy and have the child. If she looks at her situation and believes it is just too difficult to continue to care for the child, she could put the child up for adoption. There are millions of families who would love to provide a loving home for a child. No matter what the difficult circumstance, they would love to adopt; but perhaps she would choose to make her child go through this procedure. What if she decided to go through the procedure, and then later found out through scientific evidence that she put her child through this pain and had to live with that in her life. We have women coming forward now in the Silent No More Campaign—women who have had abortions who have for years afterwards—decades afterwards—struggled with the thought of having an abortion. They say: My goodness. How could I do that to my own child in the womb? They are saying women deserve better. They have struggled with this for years and are now coming out with it; receiving the sympathy which they deserve for having gone through something at a very difficult time in their lives.

This bill will be introduced in both Chambers today. It is an important piece of legislation. It is one which I hope we can move forward with aggressively. If there is evidence on the other side, I would welcome it coming forward. Let us have this debate, but let us not ignore it any longer.

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority side has 40 seconds remaining.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I would like to speak later in commending Senator BROWNBACK on his legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of it. I think it is a reasonable moderation on the excesses of abortion. I commend him for his leadership. I will speak on the Rice nomination later.

I was asked to propound this request:

I ask unanimous consent that during the hour of debate on the Rice nomination, time on the Democratic time be divided as follows: Senator BIDEN, 20 minutes; Mrs. BOXER, 5 minutes; Mr. LIEBERMAN, 5 minutes, which was originally reserved for Senator BYRD.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I further ask unanimous consent that the order of speakers remain divided under the previous order.

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

Who yields time?

NOMINATION OF CONDOLEEZZA RICE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Democratic side has yielded their time.

Mr. President, we are going to be in the final debate on the nomination of Dr. Rice. Yesterday, I asked my colleagues to be careful in their criticism. The position of Secretary of State is the voice and the advocacy of the policy of our country. We need to have a unity of purpose for the advancement of freedom. If people want to criticize some things, they should come up with positive, constructive ideas so as not to diminish the credibility of our Secretary of State.

What I saw yesterday on the floor—and to some extent in the Foreign Relations Committee—that the confirmation proceeding of Dr. Rice is evolving into an overly partisan attack. I found out later yesterday evening that some of the attacks have really gone overboard. We heard about accountability—accountability for the prosecution of the war on terrorism, whether in Afghanistan or in the Iraq theater. The accountability was really determined by the people of this country with their votes for President George W. Bush to be reelected as President.

However, we have heard from some on the other side of the aisle a continuation of their campaign arguments, whether here on the floor or in committee.

There has been for years a very logical approach that in times of war, when we have our troops in harm's way overseas, in precarious and dangerous positions with their boots on the ground, that partisan politics ends at our waters' edge. We have heard that. When troops are abroad, partisan politics ends at our waters' edge.

Unfortunately, that time-honored, respectful practice has been breached. Even worse than the outrageous statements in these serious times is we find that statements are being used for political posturing—but even worse, political fundraising. We have heard the arguments made in the sense that Oh well, this is advice and consent. This is from a fundraising letter based upon the argument and opposition to Condoleezza Rice. The fundraising letter from the DSCC sent to DSCC friends, talks about how the Senate must take its advice and consent role during the confirmation process. Advice and consent is fine. That is to be allowed, but advice and consent doesn't mean politicking and soliciting funds.

That is exactly what has happened, in a very, and in my view, harmful way in some of the debate. It harms and diminishes the ability of our Secretary of State, Dr. Rice. She has great credibility, and I think she will still have great credibility. But there is going to be the question: Gosh, some in the United States don't think she is up to the task.

There have been certain personal attacks.

But to try to solicit political contributions from such damaging rhetoric, in my view, is deplorable; it is dangerous; and, it is disgusting.

Here is how they end the letter. This is signed by the junior Senator from