

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell those who happen to be mortgage holders across America they have a surprise in store. It is the Republican Christmas tax.

Here is what it is all about: In order to force the President's hand on this budget negotiation, Speaker GINGRICH has suggested he would close down the Government.

Major economists know if that occurs interest rates go up. People who have adjusted rate mortgages, where the interest rates vary as those interest rates go up, will have to pay more on their monthly mortgage payment.

So Merry Christmas, America. What Speaker GINGRICH would like to do is close down the Government, raise the interest rates, force higher payments on people's home mortgages.

We just read in the paper this morning working families are finding it tougher than ever to get by. They do not need to receive this sort of Christmas gift from Speaker GINGRICH, this kind of hidden tax, that imposes a greater burden on families in America. It is unfair.

What we need is a bipartisan, commonsense approach that does not cut Medicare, that does not provide a tax break for the wealthiest of Americans. That is what people sent us to Washington to do.

TAXPAYER-SUBSIDIZED LOBBYING

(Mr. COBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, if one were to take the time to explain the current controversy over taxpayer-subsidized lobbying to the average American, I have no doubt that the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich language would win easy approval.

Most of my constituents are flabbergasted to learn that taxpayer-subsidized lobbying occurs at all. They do not believe it is an appropriate use of their tax dollars. It is only inside the beltway that it is considered normal for groups to receive Federal grants that enable those same groups to lobby for more Federal grants. Mr. Speaker, this pernicious practice must end.

A few weeks ago, the House voted to retain the Istook language in an appropriations bill. Now, it is doubtful that that bill will ever make it to the Senate floor. And Senate conferences on a different vehicle have refused to add it to that bill. Mr. Speaker, the instincts of the average American are right. No one can plausibly justify the continuation of taxpayer-subsidized lobbying as we have come to know it.

Mr. Speaker, let us say no to business as usual and at the same time stand up for the taxpayer. Yes to the Istook-McIntosh language on Treasury—Postal.

PROHIBITING DEFENSE CONTRACTORS FROM LOBBYING

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, basically what is going on here is not a debate about will we cut the budget. Of course. It is not a debate about will we cut the deficit. Of course. The question is who bears the brunt of the cuts, and is that fair.

You know, we just heard a 1-minute about charities lobbying. Well, I have an amendment trying to prohibit defense contractors from lobbying. Guess what, it got turned down. You talk about federally subsidized lobbying, and boy, did it pay off. They are getting about \$8 billion more in defense dollars than the President asked for or the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for.

So to get to a balanced budget then, if you are going to let those paid lobbyists have their way, you are going to have to cut someone else. So who are we cutting? Well, we hear the Speaker saying he hopes Medicare dies on the vine, so I guess we are going to cut the older people. We see people saying we have got to do away with nursing home provisions and so forth.

So the issue is not will we, the question is how we, and the question is who we listen to.

VOTE "YES" ON THE PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, my friends, can 3 inches really be our guide to death over live?

Can 3 inches determine the definition of "person" under the 14th and 5th amendments?

Have we become so hardened in our hearts that not even the killing of a child during birth can be recognized as wrong?

It was not always so in America. At one point in our history, "We held these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life * * *"

God have mercy on us.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 1833, the partial birth abortion ban.

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, adjust your hearing aids, purchase new spectacles. Yes, if you were surprised to hear NEWT GINGRICH telling the truth for a change that he wanted, as his words say, "Now, we don't get rid of it

in round one," referring to Medicare, "because we don't think that is politically smart, and we don't think that is the right way to go through a transition period; but we believe it is going to wither on the vine," then you have not been listening and you have not been watching.

Because there is nothing new about this plan to wreck Medicare. It was only in February that his very own Progress and Freedom Foundation newspaper entitled their lead editorial "For Freedom's Sake, Eliminate Social Security," and proceeded to say it is time to slay the largest Government entitlement program of all, Social Security.

What we have had here this year is round 1 of eliminating and destroying Medicare and Social Security.

The Republicans did not come to this Congress to save Social Security and Medicare. They came to bury it.

WHAT DOES THE PRESIDENT REALLY WANT?

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that most Americans are confused as to what the President wants in a Federal budget. The President has said that he wants, one, a plan that will balance the Federal budget in 7 years; two, a plan that will save Medicare from bankruptcy; three, a plan that will end welfare as we know it; and, four, a plan that will cut taxes for families and reduce the capital gains tax to spur job creation and economic growth.

But the President has never presented a plan that would balance the budget and do these other things. The Congress has. However, the President has announced he intends to veto this plan that will balance the budget the House and Senate will shortly send to him.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not understand why the President would veto the only plan that will balance the Federal budget and accomplish the goals he says he supports which is also what the American people want.

Why go through all of that trouble? What does the President really want, Mr. Speaker?

PLAYING WITH FIRE

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are some in this House who have suggested that perhaps the United States should default on its debt limit and, therefore, default on Treasury bonds.

As one who came to this House from the private sector, who came to this House from the securities industry, let

me tell you if we default on Treasury bonds, it will be violating a faith that the U.S. Government has had with the rest of the world and with its taxpayers since we came into existence.

If we break that faith, we will never again regain the confidence of the markets; but, furthermore, we will hurt U.S. bondholders which include pensioners throughout this country. We will hurt homeowners who will see their mortgage rates to up, particularly those who have adjustable rate mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, you are playing with fire if you are talking about defaulting on United States debt. Do not default, or history will find you wrong.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Commerce, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Science, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1995

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 251 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 251

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered as read for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report

the bill, as amended, to the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILEN-SON] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yield is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 251 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1833, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, of all of the issues with which our society, and this Congress, grapples, perhaps none is so contentious and difficult as the issue of abortion. It is an issue on which thoughtful people of good will, who have carefully pondered and considered its various aspects, passionately disagree, each side believing it is protecting the most fundamental of rights.

And yet, as divisive as this issue is, a majority of the citizens of our Nation have sought and found some common ground. One such area of general agreement relates to use of taxpayer funds. Most Americans do not think the money they send to their Government should be used to pay for elective abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bill that we will debate today is another area where we can find that common ground. Because through this bill we will bring to an end a practice that is so gruesome and horrific and so repugnant to the valuing of human life that the American Medical Association's Council on Legislation voted unanimously to recommend that the AMA Board of Trustees endorse this bill, with one member voting that the council members agreed that this procedure is basically repulsive.

Mr. Speaker, let me stress that this debate is not about the myriad of other issues relating to abortion. This bill is very narrowly drawn to address only this particular procedure, and that is why we have brought this bill to the floor under a closed rule. While the Rules Committee has successfully worked to drastically reduce the number of closed rules in this Congress as compared to past years, it is appropriate to limit the debate on this very narrow proposal, and not attempt to use this as a vehicle to debate the enormous range of contentious issues relating to abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we have some anomalies in our laws across the country regarding the rights and interests of chil-

dren. We recognize that children of parents who die before the child's birth should nevertheless be recognized as heirs of that parents's estate—establishing a property right for unborn children. We recognize causes of action for death or injury to unborn children—recognition of their right to be free from injury or pain. The moment a child is born any intentional injury to that child can be prosecuted as child abuse. And yet, the procedure we debate today indisputably causes pain and ends the life of partially born children—children whose bodies have been delivered and are outside the mother's womb but whose heads remain inside while the doctor ends the child's life and then finished the birth—except there is no birth now because the child is now dead. And currently, our laws do not protect these children.

Mr. Speaker, surely this is an area where we can find that elusive common ground—and prohibit a procedure used in lateterm abortions that measures the difference between life and death in inches. A procedure that one practitioner admits he has used for purely elective abortions 80 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this bill is a place for us to set aside our other differences and unite in prohibiting a violent, morally repugnant practice. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILEN-SON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding the customary 30 minutes of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose in the strongest possible terms both this closed rule and the legislation it makes in order. This is, we believe, a dangerous piece of legislation that makes it a crime to perform a medically established, safe method of completing late abortions. We oppose the bill not only because it is the first time the Federal Government would ban a form of abortion, but also because it is part of an effort to make it virtually impossible for any abortion to be performed late in a pregnancy, no matter how endangered the mother's life on health might be.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so as the author of California's Therapeutic Abortion Act, which our then Governor Mr. Reagan signed into law back in 1967, which is one of the first laws in the Nation passed to protect the lives of women, I cannot express how strongly and strenuously I oppose the bill, and how profoundly sad and disturbing I find it that we seem to be poised to turn back the clock 30 years by insisting again, as we used to, that the State, and not the individual woman and her family, make this most personal and horrific decision for every family facing this tragic choice.