

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

California. It ends with this reference to the Rice nomination—assertions and allegations about Dr. Rice.

So while I raise my voice on the Senate floor, I hope you will join us on the campaign trail and the loudest message of all, one that all Republicans will not be able to ignore, unseating them in the midterm elections and sending more Democrats to the Senate.

Several times through this letter, it says contribute to the DSCC.

It is fine to have a debate. There should be the concept of advice and consent, but it ought not to be soliciting and politicking. Clearly to be using something as serious as the nomination and confirmation of our Secretary of State to solicit campaign fund is particularly deplorable, especially during our global war on terror when we are trying to get more allies and friends to join with us.

I hope as we get to this vote in about one hour that this sort of political chicanery, political maneuvering and solicitation of funds, and using something as important as this nomination will cease and desist.

I thank you, Mr. President, and my colleagues for allowing me this time to say this.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will rein in this sort of behavior. I don't want to say each and every one of them condones it, but it is deplorable behavior that must cease.

I yield the floor.

---

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

---

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF CONDOLEEZZA RICE TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:30 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 4, which the clerk will now report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Condoleezza Rice, of California, to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. shall be allocated in the following order: The Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN; the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN; the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID; and the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. FRIST; with the last 5 minutes reserved for the Senator from Indiana or his designee.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I have the pleasure and the honor to commend the nomination of Dr. Condoleezza Rice. Soon, the Senate will carry out

its constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on President Bush's nominee for the office of Secretary of State. We will be participants in an historic moment that will reaffirm the Senate's role in foreign policy and underscore the brilliance of the constitutional design.

Last week, the Committee on Foreign Relations held exhaustive hearings on this nomination. Dr. Rice fielded questions on dozens of subjects for more than 10½ hours over 2 days. All 18 members of the Committee took advantage of the opportunity to ask Dr. Rice questions. At the hearings, she responded to 199 questions—129 from Democrats and 70 from Republicans. In addition, in advance of the hearings, members of the Committee submitted 191 detailed questions for the record to Dr. Rice. Members received answers to each of these questions. Thus, Dr. Rice responded to a total of 390 questions from Senators. In American history, few cabinet nominees have provided as much information or answered as many questions during the confirmation process. She demonstrated that her understanding of U.S. foreign policy is comprehensive and insightful.

Our hearings and yesterday's floor action served not only as an examination of Dr. Rice's substantial qualifications, but also as a fundamental debate on the direction of U.S. foreign policy. This debate was useful to the Senate and to the American people. Having the opportunity to question a Secretary of State nominee is a key aspect of Congressional oversight of any administration's foreign policy. Dr. Rice enthusiastically embraced this function of the hearings.

In my judgment she is extraordinarily well-qualified to become Secretary of State. Even Dr. Rice's opponents have taken the time to admire her accomplishments and her qualifications. She is a person of conviction, loyalty, integrity, and ability. As a result of her distinguished service as National Security Advisor to President Bush and her earlier assignments on the NSC, she is well known to many Members of the Senate. We have observed her energy, her expertise, and her devotion to this country. I appreciate the cooperation that she has provided to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to me personally.

I had the good fortune to visit Dr. Rice before she assumed the post of National Security Adviser. Before President George W. Bush was elected, I participated with Dr. Rice at Stanford University meetings on foreign policy hosted by former Secretary of State, George Shultz. Secretary Shultz, a close friend of many in the Senate, was an early supporter of then Governor Bush. He recognized Dr. Rice's prodigious talent and encouraged her leadership within the Bush foreign policy team. At the Stanford University meetings, Dr. Rice demonstrated analytical brilliance and broad knowledge of world affairs. During the 2000 Presi-

dential campaign, she established a trusted relationship with Governor Bush that has carried through in her work as National Security Adviser.

The enormously complex job before Dr. Rice will require all of her talents and experience. American credibility in the world, progress in the war on terrorism, and our relationships with our allies will be greatly affected by the Secretary of State's leadership and the effectiveness of the State Department in the coming years. We recognize the deep personal commitment necessary to undertake this difficult assignment, and we are grateful that a leader of her stature is willing to step forward.

Opponents of the nomination have focused primarily on individual statements made by the nominee during her tenure as National Security Adviser. I simply observe that Dr. Rice has spent 4 years in one of the most intense crucibles of leadership imaginable. The scrutiny that National Security Advisers must live under is unrelenting, and their responsibility for foreign policy outcomes often is exceeded only by the President, who makes the final decision. Dr. Rice has been in the arena making tough decisions and answering tough questions on a daily basis for 4 years. I do not remember any National Security Adviser who did not have bruises to show for stepping into this arena. The attachment of controversies to a National Security Adviser is inevitable. Even as Senators scrutinize Dr. Rice's record, we must not fail to recognize the level of sacrifice, courage, and discipline that is required to be National Security Adviser. Her proven fortitude in meeting these challenges and in sustaining herself physically and mentally through the pressures of responsibility is impressive.

Dr. Rice is not just a survivor. Even under intense pressure, she has performed her duties successfully with thoughtfulness, fairness, and magnanimity. These are exactly the qualities that we want in our top diplomat. And these qualities already have produced results. Dr. Rice has contributed to numerous policy successes in the Bush administration. These successes have involved issues as diverse as our non-proliferation policies, our campaign against global AIDS, and reform of our post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction mechanisms. Befitting the role of National Security Adviser, she has not been in the limelight claiming credit for successes. Instead, she has performed without ego, while preserving the trust of the President. This close relationship will serve her well at the State Department.

The Secretary of State serves as the President's top foreign policy advisor, as our Nation's most visible emissary to the rest of the world, and as manager of one of the most important Departments in our Government. Any one of these jobs would be a challenge for even the most talented public servant. The Secretary of State, at this critical time in our history, must excel in all three roles.