Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the adjournment resolution, which is at the desk, and further that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 27, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 27, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, June 7, 1999, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Monday, June 7, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill, S. 1062.

AMENDMENT NO. 397

(Purpose: To repeal the restriction on use of Department of Defense facilities for privately funded abortions)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], for herself, Mrs. SNOWE, Ms. MUKULSK, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. SCHUMER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 397.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

In title VII, at the end of subtitl B, add the following:

SEC. 717. RESTORATION OF PREVIOUS POLICY REGARDING RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES.

Section 1003(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and (b); and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "(a) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—"

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is the Murray-Snowe amendment that concerns our brave young women who serve in the military and their right to pay for their own safe, reproductive health care services. I am here today, again joined by Senator SOWE and many others, to offer our amendment to protect military personnel and their dependents' access to safe, affordable, and legal reproductive health care services.

That is exactly what this amendment is all about—access to safe, affordable, and legal reproductive health care services. That is why the Department of Defense supports this amendment, as does the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. The Department of Defense recognizes that it has a responsibility to ensure the safety of all of its troops, including our women.

Many of you may wonder why Senator SOWE and I continue to offer this amendment year after year. Why don't we just give up? Let me tell my colleagues, the reason I come to the floor every year during the Department of Defense authorization bill is to continue to educate in the hope that a majority of you will finally stand up for all military personnel.

As I have in the past, I come here today to urge my colleagues to guarantee to all military personnel and their dependents the right to pay for their own safe, legal reproductive health care services because they have made a commitment to serve our country.

Many of our military personnel serve in hostile areas in countries that do not provide safe and legal abortion services. Military personnel and their families should not be forced to seek back-alley abortions, or abortions in facilities that do not meet the same standards that we expect and demand in this country. In many countries, women who seek abortions do so at great risk of harm. It is a terrifying process.

I heard from a service woman in Japan who was forced to go off base to seek a legal abortion. Unfortunately, there was no guarantee of the quality of care. She was placed under great risk. She had no way of understanding questions that were asked of her, and she had no way of communicating her questions or concerns during the procedure. Is that the kind of care that we want our service personnel to receive? Don't they deserve better? I am convinced that they do.

This amendment is not—let me repeat—is not about Federal funding of abortions. The woman herself would be responsible for the cost of her care, not the taxpayer. This amendment simply allows women who are in our services to use existing military facilities that exist already to provide health care to active-duty personnel and their families. These clinics and hospitals are already functioning. There would be no added burden.

I also want to point out that this amendment would not change the current conscience clause for medical personnel. Health care professionals who object to legal, reproductive health care services could still refuse to perform them. Nobody in the military would be forced to perform any procedure he or she objects to as a matter of conscience.

I hope that all of you who are concerned about Federal funding, I argue that current practice and policy results in more direct expenditures of Federal funds than simply allowing a woman herself to pay for the cost of this service at the closest medical military facility.

Today, when a woman in the military needs an abortion or wants an abortion, she first has to approach her duty officer to request from him or her medical leave. Then she has to ask for transport to a U.S. base with access to legal abortion-related services. Her duty officer has to grant the request, remove her from active duty, and transport her to the United States. This is an expensive, taxpayer-funded, and inefficient system. Not only is there cost of transportation, but there is cost to military readiness when active personnel is removed for an extended period of time.

As we all know, women are no longer simply support staff in the military. Women command troops and are in key military readiness positions. Their contributions are beyond dispute. While women serve side by side with their male counterparts, they are subjected to archaic and unnecessary health care restrictions. Women in the military deserve our respect and they deserve better treatment.

In addition to the cost and the loss of personnel, we have to ask: What is the impact on the woman's health? A woman who is stationed overseas can be forced to delay the procedure for several weeks until she can get her travel to the United States where she can get safe, adequate, legal health care. For many women, every week an abortion is delayed is a risk to her health.

Why should a woman who is serving our country in the military be placed...