

life and my life, instead of just sort of leaving it up to nature, because look where nature had gotten me up to this point." [NAF video transcript, p. 4]

Tammy Watts, whose baby was aborted by Dr. McMahon in the 7th month, said: "I had a choice. I could have carried this pregnancy to term, knowing everything that was wrong. [Testimony before Senate Judiciary Committee, Nov. 17, 1995]

"My husband and I were able to talk, and the best that we could, we put our emotions aside and said, 'We cannot let this go on; we cannot let this child suffer anymore than she has. We've got to put an end to this.'" [NAF video transcript, p. 4]

Claudia Crown Ades, who appeared with President Clinton at the April 10 veto, said: "The purpose of this is so that my son would not be tortured anymore . . . knowing that my son was going to die, and was struggling and living a tortured life inside of me, I should have just waited for him to die—is this what you're saying?"

[material omitted]

"My procedure was elective. That is considered an elective procedure, as were the procedures of Coreen Costello and Tammy Watts and Mary Dorothy-Line and all the other women who were at the White House yesterday. All of our procedures were considered elective." [Quotes from transcript of taped appearance on WNTM radio, April 12, 1996]

QUOTE FROM "ABORTING AMERICA" BY BERNARD N. NATHANSON, M.D. WITH RICHARD N. OSTLING

How many deaths were we talking about when abortion was illegal? In N.A.R.A.L. we generally emphasized the drama of the individual case, not the mass statistics, but when we spoke of the latter it was always "5,000 to 10,000 deaths a year." I confess that I knew the figures were totally false, and I suppose the others did too if they stopped to think of it. But in the "morality" of our revolution, it was a useful figure, widely accepted, so why go out of our way to correct it with honest statistics?

HONORING THE LIFE OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on October 15, we honored the late Senator Mike Mansfield with the unveiling of the new book, "Senator Mansfield: The Extraordinary Life of a Great American Statesman and Diplomat," by author Don Oberdorfer.

To many, he was Senator Mansfield, Majority Leader Mansfield, or Ambassador Mansfield. To us in Montana, he was just Mike. He was our Mike. He was humble, self effacing, and didn't want people making a big fuss about him.

Although he wouldn't have wanted one, I'd like to thank the University of Montana and their alumni for hosting an event here in the Capitol to commemorate the life and times of Mike through this new book.

Mike had three great loves in his life: his wife Maureen, his State of Montana and serving in the United States Senate. Maureen was the love of his life. He always said that his successes were because of her. The last time I visited Mike in the hospital his face lit up when he talked about her. "What a gal," he said. "What a gal she was."

Mike was a good friend and a great inspiration to many people, including myself. Mike encouraged me to get into public service, he was my mentor when I was first elected to Congress, and he provided me sage counsel until his death.

Mike would think that tonight's event was too much. That is just the kind of man he was. But it's our job to keep his memory alive and educate others on what a great impact he had on Montana, the Nation, and the world. It's our responsibility to ensure others can learn from his example of working together to do what's right.

The University of Montana Alumni Association, the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Library, the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Center, and the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation here in Washington, D.C. all put forth a great effort to make this event possible. I greatly appreciate their hard work and dedication to the legacy of Maureen and Mike Mansfield.

And finally, I wish to recognize Don Oberdorfer for his persistence and dedication in writing about Mike's life. I thank Don for honoring a great man, our Mike. Montana's Mike Mansfield. He had the hands of a miner, the mind of a scholar, and the heart of a hero. We pay tribute to him and his beloved Maureen.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a horrific double homicide that occurred in 1996. Two lesbian women hiking in Shenandoah National Park were assaulted and gagged. Their assailant slashed each woman's throat, leaving them for dead in the forest. Although still awaiting trial, the man accused of killing the women stated that they deserved to die because they were homosexuals.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE CRISIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the international coffee crisis. With much of the world focused on Iraq and the Middle East, it is perhaps not surprising that a crisis affecting tens of millions people, on virtually every corner of the Earth, has received little attention.

The worldwide price of coffee has plummeted almost 70 percent over the last several years. This has devastated the economies of poor countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; it has ruined the livelihoods of millions of people; and it has damaged our foreign aid and counter-narcotics efforts in these countries.

For example, over the last few years, the United States has provided almost \$3 billion to Colombia for counter-narcotics assistance. This has made Colombia the top recipient of U.S. assistance outside of the Middle East.

Even though this is an extremely generous amount of aid, the goals and objectives are being undermined by the collapse of coffee prices. Last year, Colombia's President Alvaro Uribe wrote a letter to me, in which he stated:

[T]he impact of the international coffee crisis on Colombian coffee growers has been devastating. In Colombia, more than 800,000 people are directly employed on coffee farms and another three million are dependent on coffee for their livelihood. Colombian coffee farmers are struggling to cover their cost of production, and the problems of oversupply and a decline in coffee prices has brought poverty and uncertainty to Colombia's coffee-growing regions, which were previously free of violence and narcotrafficking activity. Additional support from the United States will help improve this dire situation in Colombia and other developing countries around the world which are also being impacted by oversupply and falling prices.

A range of humanitarian relief agencies, with operations around the world, further support President Uribe's views. For example, an Oxfam report on the topic found:

The coffee crisis is becoming a development disaster whose impact will be felt for a long time. Families dependent on money generated by coffee are pulling their children, particularly girls, out of school, can no longer afford basic medicines, and are cutting back on food. Beyond farming families, national economies are suffering. Coffee traders are going out of business, some banks are in trouble, and governments that rely on the export revenues that coffee generates are faced with dramatically declining budgets for education and health programs and little money for debt repayment.

The United States is, by far, the biggest importer of coffee. At the same time, we provide billions of dollars of foreign aid to nations impacted by the coffee crisis. It is common sense. The United States has a strong interest in finding a solution to this international problem.

A couple of years ago, several of us in Congress started asking questions about what the administration is doing to address this issue. It is safe to say that we were disappointed with the answers.

There are some good programs being run by different agencies within the Government. But, there are so many agencies involved—State, USAID, Agriculture, USTR, Treasury—and there are times when one hand does not seem to know what the other is doing. For example, USAID has programs in Latin America to help coffee farmers find alternative livelihoods, because of the