shown in effective congressional oversight. Our security and the American people are the losers in this regard.

Late on a February Friday afternoon—a time often used by the current administration to bury news stories—the FBI quietly released a report on its broken ''Office of Professional Responsibility.'' The report was occasioned in part by FBI whistleblowers who had the courage to stand up and denounce longstanding problems in the way the FBI disciplined itself. One recommendation of the OPR report was to adopt a reform Senator GRASSLEY and I have introduced over the last few years as part of our FBI Reform Act. Like oversight, our legislative efforts to improve the practices of the Executive branch also seem stymied. This Republican-controlled Senate will not even consider enacting reforms we all know are needed, that watchdogs within the Executive have endorsed.

So here we are, over 13 months after we last saw General Ashcroft, and we have no schedule for the long overdue appearance by the Attorney General of the United States before the oversight committee of the Senate. Republican Senators may have disagreed with Attorney General Reno's leadership on certain issues, but they cannot say that she did not appear before the Judiciary Committee for hours and hours at a time and listen to our questions and seek to answer the questions of all Senators, Republicans and Democrats. By contrast, the current Attorney General found the time to make a 19-city cross country tour last year in which he appeared before friendly, handpicked audiences and delivered a series of statements seeking to defend his use of the PATRIOT Act. He finds time to attend virtually every press conference on an indictment or case development in high profile cases. Yet he has not, and apparently will not, appear before the people's elected representatives to answer our questions, hear our concerns and work with us to improve the work of the Department of Justice.

We in Congress have the constitutional obligation and public responsibility to oversee the Department of Justice's operations. After September 11, after we expressed our sorrow for the victims and our determination to respond while preserving American freedoms, I publicly noted my regret that we had not performed more effective and thorough oversight of the Department of Justice in the years before 2001. During the 17 months in 2001 and 2002 when I chaired the Judiciary Committee I worked with all Members, Republicans and Democrats, to provide real oversight. There were times when the Attorney General used our hearings as a forum to attack us and our patriotism but we persisted to perform our constitutional duties. It is with deep regret that I report to the Senate and the American people that it is now more than a year since the Attorney General of the United States last appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is with sadness that I note the lack of effective oversight the Committee and the Senate are conducting on matters that threaten the freedoms and security of the American people.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of April as Child Abuse Prevention Month.

Child abuse continues to be a significant problem in the United States. It was estimated that in 2001, 903,000 children were the victims of child abuse or neglect. Child abuse is a crime perpetrated on the innocent and the defenseless.

In 2003, there were 17,345 substantiated child abuse or neglect cases in New Mexico. We must protect these children who cannot protect themselves. By acknowledging April as Child Abuse Prevention Month, we are increasing awareness in the hopes that no more children live in fear.

Across this Nation, numerous individuals and organizations dedicate countless hours of selfless work in the fight against child abuse. Many of the organizations that work to end child abuse began at the local level. I would like to acknowledge one of these organizations from my home State in Las Cruces, NM. The child abuse awareness team consists of around 40 members who recognized a need in their community and resolved to make a change. This team of volunteers, law enforcement agents, school personnel and social service agency representatives, continually strives to protect the children in Dona Ana County.

The child abuse awareness team educates the community about child abuse prevention and reporting child abuse and neglect, promotes enforcement of child abuse and neglect laws, and provides advocacy for child abuse victims. They believe the most effective child abuse prevention programs succeed when the entire community is involved. The child abuse awareness team has developed this support system within the community by creating partnerships among social service agencies, schools, religious and civic organizations, law enforcement agencies, and the business community.

The child abuse awareness team is taking the right steps in preventing child abuse incidents. I would like to specifically recognize the founder of this community organization Jesús Frietze, a social worker who saw a need in his community and took action. It is noble actions, from individuals like Jesús, who make a difference not only in the local communities but in our States and our Nation.

By taking this month to recognize the problem of child abuse, I hope we will all do our part to combat this epidemic.

THE PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT COURT TRIALS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to draw the attention of my colleagues to an issue that is currently being debated in Federal district courts in New York, Nebraska, and San Francisco. Today, the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act, which we overwhelmingly passed and saw signed into law last year, is being challenged in three Federal courts across the country. This law bans the gruesome procedure known as partial birth abortion, which is performed over a three-day period in the second or third trimester of pregnancy. In this particular abortion technique, the physician delivers all but the baby's head through the birth canal, stabs the baby in the base of the skull with curved scissors, and then uses a suction catheter to remove the child's brain.

As we have seen these trials go forward, I have been disturbed at some of the testimony that has been given in opposition to this legislation, and I wanted to ensure that my colleagues were aware of it.

In particular, in the testimony of these doctors who are challenging this law, we see a complete disregard for any consideration of the pain a child experiences during a late-term abortion. On March 30, in the New York case, the judge asked the doctor testifying whether the fetus having pain ever crossed his mind. The witness, who does not perform partial birth abortions, but who has been present when they were done, replied, ''No.'' The judge further questioned the witness as to whether the mother of the child was informed as to the specifics of the procedure in terms that the patient can understand.

The Witness: I guess I would say that whenever we describe medical procedures we try to do so in a way that's not offensive or gruesome or overly graphic for patients.

The Court: Can they fully comprehend unless you do? Not all of these mothers are Rhodes scholars or highly educated, are they?

The Witness: No, that's true. But I'm also not exactly sure what using terminology like sucking the brains out would . . .

The Court: That's what happens, doesn't it?

The Witness: Well, in some situations that might happen. There are different ways it could be dealt with, but that is one way of describing it.

This witness further testified that up until the last steps of a partial birth abortion, the feet of the child could be moving.

On April 5, another doctor testifying for the plaintiffs in New York showed similar callous disregard for the pain the fetus might feel.

The Court: Do you ever tell them (the women) that after that is done you are going to suction or suck the brain out of the skull?

The Witness: I don't use suction.

The Court: Then how do you remove the brain from the skull?

The Witness: I use my finger to disrupt the central nervous system, thereby the skull collapses and I can easily deliver the remainder of the fetus through the cervix.

The Court: Do you tell them you are going to collapse the skull?

The Witness: No.

The Court: The mother?

The Witness: No.

The Court: Do you tell them whether or not that hurts the fetus?

The Witness: I have never talked to a fetus about whether or not they experience pain.

The Court: I didn't say that, Doctor. Do you tell the mother whether or not it hurts the fetus?

The Witness: I don't believe the fetus does feel pain at the gestational ages that we do, but I have no evidence to say one way or the other so I can't answer that question.

Yet even this week, Dr. Kanwaljeet Anand, a pediatrician at the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and a witness in the Nebraska case, testified that the procedure would cause ''severe and excruciating'' pain to the fetus. He said, ''What we have noted from studies of premature infants is that they have a much lower threshold for pain, meaning they are more sensitive to pain than the full term infant. In fact, some types of pain are three times greater sensitivity in the pre-term baby as compared to the full term neonate.'' He went on to say, ''I would say between 20 and 30 weeks of gestation is the greatest sensitivity to pain.'' ''The threshold for pain is very low. The fetus is very likely extremely sensitive to pain during the gestation of 20 to 30 weeks. And so the procedures associated with the partial-birth abortion that I just described would be likely to cause severe pain, right from the time the fetus is being manipulated and being handled to the time that the incision is made, and the brain or the contents, intracranial contents, are sucked out.''

Another aspect of the current court challenges to this law centers around whether partial birth abortions are ever medically necessary. Those arguing against the law have expressed their opinion that the procedure is a medical necessity. The Department of Justice is defending the law by supporting the extensive congressional findings included in the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act that indicate that partial birth abortions are never medically necessary. For this reason the Department of Justice has sought the release of abortion records in order to demonstrate that partial birth abortions are never medically necessary. In order to ensure patient privacy, any personal information on these records which could identify a patient would be deleted prior to being submitted for review. Since those arguing against this law have done so claiming the ''medical necessity of this procedure,'' it seems reasonable that they be required to show evidence which backs up their claims.

Those testifying in opposition of banning the use of this inhumane procedure have continued to state its medical necessity. However, under questioning from Department of Justice attorneys and Judge Casey in New York, these abortionists have conceded that there are no studies which show this procedure to be less risky for the mother than other types of late-term abortions. They have also not been able to deliver any records showing its medical necessity, though this claim is at the core of their case. Some witnesses have indicated that this information would be found in the patient's medical chart—the ones which they have refused to release.

On April 6, Judge Casey in New York had this to say on April 6 regarding these medical records:

I have no comprehension why there is such resistance from doctors maintaining as they argue as to the appropriateness, the safety, etc., of these procedures, why the records, in this case that book, should not be opened for examination. To not have it turned over to the government continues not in a fashion of a level playing field and I don't think was what was envisioned as to how we should administer trials of this nature or any trials in this court.

I would hope that the hospital would rethink their position. I would also urge any of the plaintiffs, if they have any records that are personal to them, that they don't wait until, shall we say, by accident or whatever means they are uncovered or stumbled upon; that they produce them, as well they should know through their counsel that our system believes in full discovery and disclosure, and concealing facts or things in this context in our courts, in federal court, is not something that is encouraged, just as the Court has expressed a strong feeling that lawyers should be open and completely candid in their statements to the Court.

I came to the floor today about this because I want my colleagues to be aware of these cases as they go forward, and especially to point out examples of some of the blatant disrespect being shown for the lives of these partially-born children and their mothers.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MEN AND WOMEN'S NCAA BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT HUSKIES

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President. I come to the floor today to congratulate the University of Connecticut Huskies' Men and Women's basketball teams on their double national championship. This is the first time any school has accomplished this incredible feat. With this achievement, coaches Jim Calhoun and Geno Auriemma have solidified their place at the peak of college basketball's coaching mountain.

On Monday night, the men, lead by terrific performances by Emeka Okafor and Ben Gordon, defeated the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets 82–73. This victory gave the men's program its second national title. On Tuesday, the women, on the strength of a brilliant 17-point effort by Diana Taurasi, completed the Huskies' double dip, knocking off the Tennessee Lady Vols by the score of 70–61 to capture their third straight national championship and the fifth in the school's history.

These victories were captured with great teamwork, which was fortified by outstanding leadership. Not just from the two legendary coaches, but from the players themselves. On the men's side, Emeka Okafor, whose dominating second half in the semi-finals against Duke is the stuff of which legends are made. That performance, followed by his brilliant 24 point 15 rebound effort in the championship game earned him Most Outstanding Player in the Final Four honors, and will most likely make him the top pick in this summer's NBA draft. On the women's side was Diana Taurasi. Diana's greatness speaks for itself. She lead the Huskies to three straight national titles, compiled a career NCAA tournament record of 22–1, and was named Most Outstanding Player in the Final Four the past two seasons.

This year started out with the greatest of expectations for both teams. They were both picked as pre-season No. 1 teams, but as the season wore on, each had their share of adversity. Coach Calhoun and Coach Auriemma saw their teams suffer tough losses and key injuries. Each team's best player would battle through nagging injuries that made many people question whether they had what it took to reach their championship aspirations. What is truly remarkable is that neither team ever doubted themselves. As the calendar turned to March, both teams battled through the adversity, and began the long steady journey toward greatness. After all the ups and downs of a long season, our UCONN Huskies finished the season where they started—on top of the college basketball world.

Mr. President, today is a day of great pride for Connecticut. We are proud of Jim Calhoun, Geno Auriemma, and their terrific players. We thank them for their brilliance. We thank them for giving us such tremendous joy in watching them play. At a time when there are so many things that divide us and have us concerned, it is so important to have something that unites us, lifts our spirits, and gives us a sense of pride. Thanks to the Huskies' unprecedented accomplishment, today we can truly say Connecticut is the College Basketball Capital of America.

MINNESOTA ATHLETICS

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, it has been a great winter when it comes to Minnesota athletics. Last week I had the privilege to congratulate and recognize the achievements of the University of Minnesota Twin-Cities women's hockey and basketball teams. Today, I switch schools and genders to recognize and congratulate head coach Scott Sandelin and the University of Minnesota-Duluth Men's ice hockey team for their appearance in the NCAA Frozen Four. The Bulldogs will be making their third NCAA Frozen Four appearance tomorrow, having previously appeared in 1984 and 1985.

The team and many of its fans are in Boston today, gearing up for the fast pace and the emotion that comes with playing in the Frozen Four on national