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Mr. President, in this Senator's view, it just makes good medical sense that a pregnant woman be referred from a Title X setting to a specialist in the field of obstetrics. I am not aware of a pregnant woman who is pregnant should receive complete and comprehensive pregnancy options counseling, from obstetrical care providers outside of a Title X facility.

I deeply respect the good intentions of my friends and colleagues. Senator Cochran and Senator Chafee in this debate. But I believe that the movement of these programs outside of a Title X family planning program with the concerns surrounding pregnancy counseling will erode the chances that Title X has for broad bipartisan support in this Congress.

For the sake of giving title X the support and funding it deserves as a key component of a healthier America, I encourage my colleagues to vote against the Cochran amendment, as well as the underlying Chafee substitute.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, soon we will vote on final passage of S. 323, the Title X Pregnancy Counseling Act of 1991.

I believe strongly that abortion should not be treated as a method of family planning. I believe that the federal government has no business interfering with the trust and trust of our society that family planning is a considered and fundamental to doctor-patient and other professional-client relationships.

Tomorrow we will decide what types of information family planning programs can give to women who confront unwanted pregnancies. After listening carefully to the debate, I face the fact that the federal government has no business interfering with the trust and trust of our society that family planning is a considered and fundamental to doctor-patient and other professional-client relationships.

The Chafee substitute protects the family planning programs from the involvement of abortion providers. It protects the women who come to the clinics from the state laws on parental consent and does not take away the ability of the federal government to support the family planning clinics. It is my understanding that the only remaining amendments are the Helms amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, also there is a possible Dooley-Hatch amendment but I doubt that that will occur. But we at least put our colleagues on notice that there might possibly be one other in addition to the Helms amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is the state of where we are. Mr. President, As I understand it, the Senator from North Carolina is not prepared to offer those amendments. If there is another amendment that's agreeable to the Senator from Utah, I think we will support it. It's the Senate's business that that is agreeable with the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. That is agreeable, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is my understanding we will have no further action on this legislation this evening and we will wait the leadership call to continue. Hopefully, a very early conclusion of the legislation.

I thank my colleagues from Utah and all Members for their cooperation and attention to the matters debated today.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues and suggest the absence of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE NATIONAL MOTOR VOTER BILL

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, may move to the consideration of Calendar No. 89, S. 260, the national motor voter bill at any time, notwithstanding provisions of rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORTON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 89, S. 260, and I now send a cloture petition to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the cloture motion.

The assistant legislative clerk reads as follows:

Clorres Morgan

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 260, a bill to establish national voter registration procedures for federal elections, and to report a substitute therefor.

Wendell Ford, Jeff Bingaman, Daniel K. Akaka, Max Baucus, Timothy E. Wirth, J.R. Boren, Jr., George Mitchell, Richard Bryan, Bob Kerrey, Joseph Lieberman, Pat Leahy, Brock Adams, Daniel K. Inouye, Bill Bradley, John P. Perry, Frank Lautenberg, Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed is withdrawn.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to open the period.

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

Dr. CAROL JANIONE

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am proud to stand here to thank those constituents who personifies the
complete information and referrals on their reproductive options. The so-called gag rule bars health care workers from providing women with information on all their medical options, including abortion. It leaves health care workers' ability to provide medical information, it also discriminates against those women whose only access to health care is through publicly funded clinics.

The bill bars access to private doctors who receive information about all their reproductive options, but under the gag rule poor women can learn only about those legal options approved by the Department of Health and Human Services. It also bars women from being able to offer this service. If family planning counselors and other health professionals in the area could not tell a pregnant client about her clinic, even upon request, the provider of unintended pregnancies could take matters into their own hands, with tragic results.

Our Government should not block a poor woman from consulting with her doctor and making her own decision about a legal abortion safely in a pregnancy. I will vote against all amendments to weaken this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN, Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 323, a bill to ensure that physicians at Title X funded health centers inform women of all their legal medical options.

Enacted in 1970, Title X of the Public Health Service Act provides funds for comprehensive, community-based programs for the prevention of unintended pregnancy. The agencies offer a wide variety of health care services for women, including gynecological examinations, breast and cervical cancer screening, pregnancy counseling, prenatal care, labor and delivery, postpartum care, and infertility programs. Many of these sites also provide prenatal care and maternity services. For many women, these services are their only form of health care.

Title X clinics have proven remarkably successful. These facilities provide health and family planning services to more than 4.1 million women each year, nearly 1 million of whom use abortion services. The services provided at Title X clinics have been effective in reducing the number of unplanned pregnancies.

In 1988, however, the quality and effectiveness of these programs were threatened when the Department of Health and Human Services, under the Reagan administration, implemented regulations which prohibit Title X clinics from providing clients with any information about pregnancy termination. Title X Programs have also been prohibited from using Federal funds to perform abortions. The 1988 regulations, however, went one step further and prohibited clinics from providing any information about abortion termination, even if the pregnant woman requested it.

These restrictive regulations took effect in March 1988 and were immediately subject to law suit and public debate. On May 23, 1991, in the decision of Rust v. Sullivan, the Supreme Court upheld the HHS regulations by a 5-4 decision.

Recent polls show a majority of the American people strongly disagree with the HHS regulations, according to the Supreme Court's decision, and believe that the 1988 gag rule forces censorship on the nation's health care system. These polls further indicate wide support for legislation which would codify previous guidelines governing title X and require that Title X recipients be allowed to receive complete counseling concerning all legal, medical options.

It is imperative that the title X Pregnancy Counseling Act be enacted for several reasons. Most importantly, the 1988 gag rule denies women seeking title X services complete information in order to make responsible, intentional decisions about their pregnancies. Before the gag rule, title X clinics were able to offer complete, individualized counseling which included all possible legal options available to pregnant women. In order to make an informed choice, women have a right to know the options, not just those that the President deems acceptable.

The 1988 regulations severely impede the relationship between patients and their physicians. The Government does not have the right to stand in the middle of this relationship or dictate the nature of this exchange. Violations of patients' doctor relationship threaten the quality of health care available to all people. Health care and the first amendment both run the risk of being put on the critical list.

For these reasons and many others, I offer my support to S. 323.

AMENDMENT NO. 785

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to briefly explain my reasons for voting against the Cochran substitute amendment to the Chafee substitute to S. 323, the Pregnancy Counseling Act.

Earlier in this debate, I offered an amendment that would have removed pregnancy counseling from the setting of a federally subsidized Title X family planning clinic. My amendment would have ensured that pregnant women referred to a pregnancy counseling setting where they could learn all of their medical options concerning pregnancy.

The Cochran amendment, and the Chafee amendment underlying it, would continue the practice of counseling pregnant women in the setting of a Title X family planning clinic. That is simply outside the intended scope of Title X, which is to provide comprehensive, community-based programs for the prevention of unintended pregnancy.

On a pregnant woman, she requires specialized services that are not within the purview of the Title X Program.

My State has a strict antiabortion law which requires parental and/or spousal consent. A new informed decision counseling program is mandated by the court. The court mandates a 24-hour delay while the woman receives complete information. This is especially onerous in a State which does not have a single doctor-performing abortions and just one clinic where a woman can receive a legal abortion on certain days of the week.

Women travel to that clinic in Fargo from across the State, as well as from Minnesota, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. Jane Bovard of the Women's Health Organization faces regular picketers and other harassment from opponents, but she continues to offer this service. If family planning counselors and other health professionals in the area could not tell a pregnant client about her clinic, even upon request, the provider of unintended pregnancies could take matters into their own hands, with tragic results.
very best of America. She is Dr. Carol Iannone, the President’s nominee for service on the National Council on the Humanities. She is from a working-class Italian family and was born and raised in the Italian section of East Harlem, and the first in her family to receive a college education.

But Dr. Iannone did not stop there. She went on to receive two advanced degrees in order to dedicate her life to the humanities. Over nearly the last 20 years, she has devoted herself to teaching and advising students about the expanded role of the humanities. She has in turn made the humanities accessible to the general public through her very lucid and thoughtful assessment of contemporary culture in public journals.

In that context, I must express my surprise to hear that Dr. Iannone is not qualified for the post. She is superbly qualified to provide advice on the various academic fields within the humanities. She has served as a university professor, teaching experience, a lengthy list of articles in well-known journals, not to mention her historical, critical, and widespread correspondence with the most prominent intellectuals today.

Let the record be clear. There can be no question about Dr. Iannone’s qualifications. She is superbly qualified to provide advice on the various academic fields within the humanities. She has served as a university professor, teaching experience, a lengthy list of articles in well-known journals, not to mention her historical, critical, and widespread correspondence with the most prominent intellectuals today.

What is really at issue here is that Dr. Iannone has dared to go on record as opposed to some of the trends in the academic community today. She has been willing to state publicly that the humanities have found a home on the American campus, and that scholarship has too often reduced itself to a political agenda that ignores quality and merit.

I rue the day when we make it impossible for persons in the academy, in newspapers, or even before the Senate to disagree with me, or even to agree with me. You and I may not always agree with what Dr. Iannone says. But that is not what is at issue here today.

What is at issue is the very freedom to speak out and to engage in that breadth of intellectual discourse that has made our universities and our country the envy of the world.

I urge all of my colleagues on the Labor and Human Resources Committee to refer to the Rochester (NY) Daily Record, June 10, 1991.

ATTACKS ON M.S. IANNONE BARRING BARE-KNEEDED AIRING

By Ray Herman

Although the issue isn’t likely to fill the front pages, it’s significant. Dr. Carol Iannone is significant all the same. It badly needs the disinterested voice of the humanities to express its concerns. Some of those who are into serious modern literature, you know that Iannone, a literature professor at New York University’s Gallatin Division, has produced an opinion, which might be called the “criticism of the last decade.”

But even if you couldn’t pick Iannone out of a police lineup, it doesn’t matter. The point is that he is a true scholar with a critical, disinterested eye for American literature.

In other words, the nomination to the council, which advises the National Endowment for the Humanities, has triggered a fresh round of bickering and for a moment seems to have been directed at the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee which must recommend it to the Senate. The bill’s sponsor is the truly mysterious and ever-popular Maurice H. Abrams of New York, who is a part of an old-fashioned Civil War veteran’s club.

The attacks on Iannone have the same odor. Her nomination may suffer the death of a thousand cuts. But what, pray tell, are Iannone’s sins and transgressions? Why are all the accusations of "incompetence" and "bias" being directed to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee which must approve the nomination? Why is it that all this is being done? Is it an ideological lynching mob forming?

Well, for one thing, Iannone has made the impulse to serve as an active member of the academy, and to criticize the organization which repeatedly has pointed to the rise of intellectual intolerance by liberal alike which is now sweeping American campuses.

According to liberal “Political Correctness” dogma, students, faculty and administrators must project the “right” views of race, gender, and other categories. Even white males must be projected as history’s primary force of oppression.

The chief victim of the “Political Correctness” mafia is Iannone. Iannone also has criticized “literary theory” by quota, noting in a recent “Commentary”, magazine piece that there has been a growing tendency to award literary prizes on the basis of race and gender rather than literary merit, further observing that the five finalists for the National Book Prize after a group of black writers demanded one for her.

She also observed that the three awards given to Alice Walker’s “The Color Purple” seemed less a recognition of literary achievement than some official act of repatriation. It was already stunningly obvious that the elitists who man the ramparts in the nation’s universities, foundations and lobbying groups like the Humanities Council have the disposition to strike too close to their thrones of power.

On Iannone’s comment about the black writer’s prizewinning, it is said that he is the author of a book that Joe Conran, president of the Guggenheim Foundation, tagged the comment as “arrogant, inflammatory nonsense,” and the president of the Modern Language Association, says that the racist accusations directed at Iannone “raise good questions.”

People for the American Way, which helped sink Bork, also weighed in with anti-Iannone commentary.

Even if Iannone survives the smear and the charges, it should be useful to wonder what her ordeal (and many
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Carol Iannone is a faculty member at New York University who has made a reputation for challenging questions about certain aspects of modern literary scholarship and criticism. Her work has been recognized with several awards, including the National Book Award for her novel "The Color Purple," which she dedicated to Alice Walker. Iannone has been nominated for a seat on the National Council of the Humanities, a position she has been both praised and criticized for her outspoken views on literary issues.

Iannone's nomination has sparked controversy, with some arguing that her views on literary criticism and her support for Alice Walker's work have clouded her judgment and disqualify her from serving on the council. Others defend her nomination, arguing that she brings a fresh perspective to the council and that her views on political correctness and social justice are important for the humanities.

The Senate is considering her nomination, and the debate is expected to be contentious. The council's role in promoting literary scholarship and protecting academic freedom is at the heart of the discussion, with some calling for a review of the nomination and others urging its approval.

The Senate is expected to vote on Iannone's nomination in the coming weeks, and the outcome will likely be closely watched by those interested in the future of the humanities and the role of the National Council of the Humanities.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 16, 1991

PUBLISH AND PERISH

We note the latest turn in the ideological and partisan struggle over the Carol Iannone nomination to the Humanities Endowment Council—Chairman Lynne Cheney took the nomination to the Senate. The battle is heating up and the chances of a successful nomination are slim. The Senate has rejected the nomination before, and the vote on the nomination is likely to be close. The Senate's decision is important because it will set a precedent for future nominations to the council.

Another aspect of the Iannone nomination that should allow people to overcome partisanship has to do with the council's mission. The council's mission is to promote the arts and humanities in the United States. This mission is important because it supports education and cultural diversity. It is also important because it promotes free speech and the exchange of ideas.

The Senate's decision to reject the Iannone nomination is disappointing. It is important to remember that the council's mission is to promote the arts and humanities, not to promote any one political ideology. The Senate's decision to reject the nomination is not consistent with this mission.

We urge the Senate to reconsider its decision and to confirm the nomination of Carol Iannone to the Humanities Endowment Council. This would be a step in the right direction and would send a clear message that the council's mission is to promote the arts and humanities, not to promote any one political ideology. We believe that Carol Iannone is well qualified for the position and that she will be an effective member of the council.

We urge the Senate to take action to confirm the nomination of Carol Iannone to the Humanities Endowment Council. This would be a step in the right direction and would send a clear message that the council's mission is to promote the arts and humanities, not to promote any one political ideology. We believe that Carol Iannone is well qualified for the position and that she will be an effective member of the council.

We urge the Senate to take action to confirm the nomination of Carol Iannone to the Humanities Endowment Council. This would be a step in the right direction and would send a clear message that the council's mission is to promote the arts and humanities, not to promote any one political ideology. We believe that Carol Iannone is well qualified for the position and that she will be an effective member of the council.
President Benno Schmidt warns that "many campuses, freedom of thought and inquiry, are in grave danger, and the campus has become a closed-minded, restricted area. It is high time, therefore, that the people suppose to go along with the activities of the university in the name of the President, in the name of a committee, and in the name of the Senate, and to discuss the chilling effect of free speech. Columnist, and ACLU Veteran, William Robins, writes specifically of Blacks, and the effects of their treatment and exclusion from the campus, and the chilling effect of free speech. His article should be rejected by the Senate, for her independent views. In the Senate, the bill that would ban the practice could be rejected by the Senate, for the Senate would have to decide whether to reject the bill. The Senate, for her independent views, is the only body in the Senate that has the right to decide whether to accept or reject the bill.

Carole Iannone, to express herself freely. It is earnestly to be hoped that those who control the Senate's Labor and Human Rights Committee, to continue to arrive, will be united and confirm Dr. Iannone to the National Council on the Humanities.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. FORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider legislative recommendations:

The President read the executive session recommendations, of which there were three:

1. The President read the recommendation that the Senate resolve the Senate's decision on the recommendations of the Senate's Labor and Human Rights Committee.

2. The President read the recommendation that the Senate resolve the Senate's decision on the recommendations of the Senate's Labor and Human Rights Committee.

3. The President read the recommendation that the Senate resolve the Senate's decision on the recommendations of the Senate's Labor and Human Rights Committee.

The President then closed the Senate's legislative session.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathern, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As an executive session, the President delivered the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees:

The nominations received today are:

The Senate proceeded.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, relative to the suspension of the rules for the consideration of the Senate's Labor and Human Rights Committee, was read by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, and announced that the Senate had passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 157. An act to name the Post Office building located at 200 3rd Street, S.W., in Taylorsville, North Carolina, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building";

H.R. 158. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building";

H.R. 159. An act to designate the building in Blodgett, Montana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building";

H.R. 1218. An act to modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for other purposes;

H.R. 2347. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building".

H.R. 2347. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building".

The following bills were read the first and second times, by unanimous consent, and referred to the Senate committees:

H.R. 157. An act to name the Post Office building located at 200 3rd Street, S.W., in Taylorsville, North Carolina, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building";

H.R. 158. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building";

H.R. 159. An act to designate the building in Blodgett, Montana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building";

H.R. 1218. An act to modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for other purposes;

H.R. 2347. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building".

The following bills were referred to the Senate committees:

H.R. 157. An act to name the Post Office building located at 200 3rd Street, S.W., in Taylorsville, North Carolina, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building";

H.R. 158. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building";

H.R. 159. An act to designate the building in Blodgett, Montana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building";

H.R. 1218. An act to modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for other purposes;

H.R. 2347. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building".

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times, by unanimous consent, and referred to the Senate committees:

H.R. 157. An act to name the Post Office building located at 200 3rd Street, S.W., in Taylorsville, North Carolina, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building";

H.R. 158. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building";

H.R. 159. An act to designate the building in Blodgett, Montana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building";

H.R. 1218. An act to modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for other purposes;

H.R. 2347. An act to designate the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service, as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building".

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment; S. 1293. A bill to authorize extensions of time limitations in certain PERC-issued licenses for coal and other coal products, and for other purposes:

By Mr. GLENN, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, without amendment; S. 892. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the United States Postal Service for certain expenses under title 5, United States Code, for Jane E. Denny of Henderson, Nevada.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NUNN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the attached listing of nominations.

Those identified with a single asterisk (*) are to be placed on the Executive Calendar. Those identified with a double asterisk (**) are to be placed on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator since these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record and to save the expense of printing again.

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

(The nominations ordered to be placed on the Secretary's desk were printed in the Record of May 15, June 3, June 24, and July 8, 1991, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

* In the Air Force Reserve there are 29 appointments to the grade of major general (list begins with Earl A. Aber, Jr.) (Reference No. 227).

** In the Air Force Reserve there is 1 appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel (Aurora T. Maldonado) (Reference No. 340).

** In the Air Force Reserve there are 8 appointments to the grade of lieutenant colonel (list begins with Norman Arents) (Reference No. 341).

** In the Air Force Reserve there are 27 promotions to the grade of lieutenant colonel (list begins with John W. Anderson) (Reference No. 341).

* In the Air Force Reserve there is 1 promotion to the grade of major (Ross L. Sandweiss) (Reference No. 341).

** In the Air Force Reserve there is 58 promotions to the grade of colonel (list begins with Richard M. Anderson) (Reference No. 342).

* General John W. Foss, USA to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general (Reference No. 412).

** Lieutenant General Joseph P. Hoar, USMC to be general (Reference No. 416).

** Lieutenant General Ernest T. Cook, Jr., USMC to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general (Reference No. 417).

* Major General Roy E. Moore, Jr., USA to be lieutenant general (Reference No. 420).

** Lieutenant General Thomas D. Roder, USA to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general (Reference No. 420).