

when we are not trying to go through the same anguish and anxiety of the many hundreds of thousands of Federal employees that are being adversely affected by our actions here.

So that is my discouragement with this process. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, with my fellow freshmen on this side of the aisle, and others to try to come together as the new year approaches, to try to work a new resolution where we can work with the administration and balance the budget together.

DUTY, HONOR, AND COUNTRY— GREATER LOVE THAN THIS NO MAN HAS THAN HE GIVE UP HIS LIFE FOR HIS FRIENDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in that beautiful State of yours, North Carolina, may you have a wonderful holiday season. And as one fellow Christian to another, a very merry Christmas on this the birth of our Savior.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to title my special order, which I believe will be the last speech of this holy week, and probably the last speech of the first session of the 104th Congress. I would like the title to be "Duty, Honor, and Country," the motto of West Point, a school that my dad dearly desired my two brothers and I would attend, but he moved us to California and diverted that path.

"Duty, Honor, and Country," followed in my title, Mr. Speaker, by the beautiful words of St. John, chapter 15, verse 13, "Greater Love Than This No Man Has Than He Give Up His Life For His Friends."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to do 30 minutes in this Christmas season on what we owe to our young men and women in uniform, particularly past. They bought for us our freedom of speech in this great legislative Chamber, and some of them with wounds that they carry to the end of their life's course in this mortal existence.

Also, I am going to, as I mentioned earlier today, think about the feast day of the Holy Innocents, the children slaughtered from newborns up to 2 years of age by the cruel despotic Roman-appointed leader of the Holy Land when Christ was born, Herod the Great, Herod the Evil, Herod the Great Builder, Herod the Destroyer of Children.

That feast day is December 28. And although we will come back in on that day, there will probably, as the majority leader said, be no votes. So on December 28 I hope some Americans, at least those who respect their Judeo-Christian or Islamic heritage, will reflect on what we are doing to children in this world. So the second 30 minutes

of my special order is going to be on whether or not our country will ever again attain greatness as long as we kill a million and a half babies in their mother's wombs and kill more than a quarter of all children conceived in this great country. More than a quarter of our pregnancies end in death.

Now, to duty, honor, country, and what one of the world's great political leaders calls us to. I watched Billy Graham on television for an hour last week and I know the great respect this great Protestant leader has for the current vicar of Christ in Rome, Pope John Paul II. Here, Mr. Speaker, from Vatican City, 2 days ago, is the Pope's message to the world.

It is in honor of all the children throughout the world who are forced to fight wars or forced to prostitute themselves, who must beg for money to eat or even beg for their parents' affections. Pope John Paul II dedicates the entire year of 1996, due to start in 9 days, to these sad and suffering children.

Here are the Pope's words and what he will formally release New Year's Day, which the Catholic Church marks as World Peace Day. The Pope says:

Let us give children a future of peace. This is the competent appeal which I make to men and women of good will, and I will invite everyone to help children to grow up in an environment of authentic peace. This is their right and it is our duty.

French Cardinal Roger Etchegaray, head of the Vatican's Commission on Peace and Justice, said the Holy Father wants, "To gather in his arms all the children who suffer, and all the healthy and happy children also." The cardinal noted that all envoys, papal envoys, including the one in Washington, DC, around the world, would deliver this message to all world leaders. So it is on its way to the White House, I trust, this week.

Pope John Paul noted the increase in regional and ethnic conflicts and he lamented:

Children have become even the targets of snipers. Their schools have been deliberately destroyed, and the hospitals where they are cared for, once wounded, have been bombed. In the face of such horrendous misdeeds, how can we fail to speak out with one voice in condemnation?

The Pope also decried that young people are, "systematically hunted down, raped, or killed during so-called ethnic cleansing." He also condemned sex tourism, which is very prevalent throughout all of the successful free market economies of the Pacific rim. In this sex tourism, children are forced to become prostitutes. And then the use of children in the drug trade, he also condemned.

Children suffering, and again this is a direct papal quote, "even in wealthy and affluent homes," also came under the Pope's scrutiny. He decried the trauma children suffer seeing marriages break up and the loneliness and lack of moral guidance of others who find their main contact with reality in television programs which often present unreal and immoral situations.

Now, at Disneyland, in my district, I went earlier this month to the beautiful Christmas carol day that the people at Disney put on in both Disney World and Disneyland. I do not know if they do it in Japan or in Europe, but they sang beautiful hymns. All of the standard Christmas hymns, everyone rising and singing together "Silent Night." They sang in one of the hymns about rejecting the evil of Satan.

I sat there and thought, Disney, like all of America, is torn between decadence and triviality and inspiration and a family future for this country. Disney's beautiful gift to everybody who was at Disneyland on that Sunday, December 10, of this month, they gave America a very strange Christmas present. Tore up the survivors of the family of Richard Nixon, one of them a grandson of both Eisenhower and the son-in-law of Richard Nixon, Dwight David Eisenhower. Tore them up with this evil characterization of Richard Nixon as a foulmouthed alcoholic, who somehow or other was feeling some fantasy guilt over the assassination of a predecessor President, John F. Kennedy, with whom he had a warm friendship when they served in the Senate together.

This strange Christmas season film, "Nixon," follows a film earlier in 1995, that I have not heard a proper apology from Disney on, the film "Priest," where although the title is singular, "Priest," it was about five Roman Catholic priests; one an adulterer, another a homosexual, another an embezzler and a thief, another one a drunk, and I have forgotten what the fifth one was. I would not give it the decency of seeing it. It was made in England but released by the Miramac division of Disney.

The Catholic League for Human and Civil Rights said if this film had been called mullah, about the Islamic faith, five loathsome people betraying the Koran; or if it had been called Rabbi, about five Rabbis betraying the commandments of Moses, who is looking down at me here, the great leader from the 1100's, Maimonides, over in the northeast corner of the House; if it had been about five Rabbis betraying their covenant with God, wouldn't this have brought the wrath of every politician in this House and the other down on the head of Disney, calling them a foul anti-Semitic organization that was the very embryonic cause of the rise of Hitler in Europe? Of course, they would have.

Disney, with a CEO of Jewish, wonderful Hebrew heritage, would not have dared release a film made in Great Britain called Rabbi or one tearing apart any other group. Suppose the film had been called King, and it was about Martin Luther King, and treated him with disrespect. They would have had every park around the world properly picketed. But no proper apology this year from Disney.

Then we find all these little sexual innuendoes stuck in there by smart

aleck animators, and my friend Michael Eisner's only comment is, what do I do, discipline the whole group? Well, you know what Walt Disney would have done? His daughter said this the other day. He would have fired everybody at Disney and started from scratch if the guilty party would not have stepped forward and accepted dismissal or suspension.

No, it is a sad day when you hear beautiful hymns at the wonderful family resorts owned by this great heretofore traditional family-respecting organization. So I would like to counter that with the words of Cardinal James Hickey of this archdiocese of Washington. He points out in his newsletter, "Reflections," that Christmas is a day when we celebrate the reality that Jesus, the eternal son of God, became one of us. He was born into our world. He was born to redeem us from our sins.

□ 1615

He was born to mend our broken hearts.

Cardinal Hickey has a beautiful letter that he gives to not just the faithful of his denomination, but to all people of God in this Capital City and Capital District of ours, and he talks about his boyhood home in Midland, MI, and how his mother would prepare this beautiful meal for his large family, and how in the afternoon he would return to the parish church with his mother to visit the crib of the infant Jesus.

He said, "It was there that my mother taught me this prayer." I had never heard this, but it captures certainly the whole spirit of the nativity of Jesus. The prayer says, "Sweet little Jesus, come and take birth in my heart."

In this beautiful city, there is a Franciscan church with a disarming name. It is called Commissariat of the Holy Land. To a military person like myself, that means commissary. Well, in a way it means the same thing. The Commissariat of the Holy Land is the headquarters in this country to raise money to take care of all of the Christian sites in Israel.

Now, yesterday, Bethlehem went from Israeli control, since 1967, back to the Arab people of Judea and Samaria. It is interesting that Bethlehem, as the birthplace of Jesus, as the Israelis have always respected, will still have Christians and Franciscans taking care of that site, this time under the care of a provisional government, Arafat's government, that will be mostly Islamic.

All of the holy sites, including where Jesus was born at Nazareth, are taken care of by the Franciscans. So, I will take my family on Christmas Eve, praying for the men and women in Bosnia, which I had hoped to give up my Christmas to be with them, instead we will go up to the Commissariat up in Northeast Washington and visit the most perfect replica of Jesus' birth site as it has been reconstructed in Nazareth, and the absolute perfect replica of

the tomb of Jesus, as it is today inside the Holy Sepulchre Church.

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to anybody of any faith, if they can find time over this next week, visit the Franciscan Commissariat. It is open to all faiths, every religion of the world. Come and see these beautiful, full-scale representations of some of the greatest spots, holy spots in that land that we all refer to as sacred, terra sacred, the Holy Land.

Now to, my theme about duty, honor, and country. I have before me a press release from the U.S. Army about an Army sergeant first class who gave his life for his country, for his friends and, actually, for the torn nation of Haiti.

He was killed less than a year ago, January 13, 1995. Army Sfc. Gregory Cardott, of Cupertino, CA. This will be the first Christmas his wife Darlene, and two beautiful daughters will spend without their hero, Green Beret father. He was assigned to the 3rd Special Forces Group for the last 3 years before his death, last January.

The Third Special Forces is that special forces group that has as its responsibility all of the Caribbean and all of the western part of the continent of Africa.

He was a proud soldier; a proud Green Beret. His brother said that he had talked to his beautiful wife, Darlene, on the phone 2 days before he was killed. They were planning to speak within the next day on his birthday. His birthday would have been January 14, the day after he was killed.

He said that he told her he felt pretty safe in Haiti and for her to not worry about him. "Greg was a heck of a guy," his brother-in-law Jack Brown said. "A real patriot. He loved to parachute, loved Special Forces, would do anything for them, any time, anywhere. He got along with just about everybody, but most of all, he loved his family."

He was born in San Mateo, grew up in Cupertino, hometown of a great minister and brother of a squadron commander of mine, a double ace in Korea and a 7-year POW, Robbie Robinson. I hope his brother, if any friends are listening, that the Reverend Reisner will please remember Gregory Cardott, whatever his faith, in their services in that beautiful California area.

Darlene is a nursing student. I hope she has completed her nursing training in the last year as a distraction for the pain in her heart. She said, "They come to your door in their beautiful uniforms and they tell you he's gone," she said with a break in her voice.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that Mr. Clinton and all of us were hoping no one would die in Haiti. I said on this House floor that this defrocked Catholic priest, who publicly would claim he loved the smell of burning flesh, was not worth the life of one decent American man or woman. I still believe, although he is leaving office, that Aristide, who I believe is an unstable person, that it was not worth putting him back in power for a year this last

September; was worth the life of Gregory Cardott.

Listen to how Gregory died. He was guarding the post with other Green Berets. An Army major, a Haitian, Haioel Frederick, and his driver rammed the checkpoint that Greg was guarding. Greg called to another soldier to jump in their humvee and they gave chase. They pulled over this victim in the village of Bigot, about 60 miles north of Port-au-Prince.

I visited with some of the special forces there this week last year. One eyewitness said that Major Frederick got out of the jeep and killed Greg Cardott on the spot and wounded the other soldier. Another soldier came driving up in a truck and jumped out and killed the gunman, so we do not have to worry about Major Frederick being released by some future Haitian Government, the way the assassins of our four Marines in June 1985, the assassins who sprayed them with automatic weapons fire and then went up and shot each one of them coup de grace in the back of their head or temple; one of them even surviving, then dying in the hospital a year later. I believe his name, well, I will not say his name, although I know it. The same name as a friend I have served with here in the House. I am afraid the parents might be listening.

They just released those assassins down in El Salvador. Before, we brought them freedom with 5,000 of our men serving there. And if Clinton decides to veto the Defense authorization bill, it will enrage me and take the breath out of me, because in that bill that he would be vetoing is the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for all 5,000 Americans, including the four ex-Marines and the helicopter crew that were executed in the back of their head, gangster style, for serving in El Salvador by the Communist Farabundo Marti in that country. We bought them their freedom. They have had now three democratically elected Presidents in a row, and yet time marches on and very few people think about these men who gave their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an American killed in Tuzla. He was not in uniform. He worked for the United Nations, and his name jumps at you off this story. William Jefferson, as in William Jefferson Clinton. He was executed, gangster style in the back of his head, by Mujahedin terrorists a few kilometers from Tuzla during the debate in this House over sending our young men and women into that killing area. Yet, I could not get his name out of our intelligence services until after the debate was over. If I had, I assure my colleagues I would have made his funeral in New Jersey 2 weeks ago a nationally recognized event, because this man also working in the name of peace died for his country, as did our three diplomats, two of them uniformed military people on leave from a diplomatic mission that were burned and killed when their French armored

vehicle rolled down a hill on that ugly, muddy road, the Igman Road that we had to cut through the hills to get into poor besieged Sarajevo.

But at this time of the year we should remember the four Americans who have died already in Bosnia. Mr. William Jefferson, Bob Frasure, Tru Nelson, and Joe Cruzell. As I said, two of them in uniform, although on leave to the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to submit, maybe the legislative day is still continuing until we adjourn here, I am going to submit a House concurrent resolution. I have already submitted it as a House joint resolution, but I should have made it a concurrent resolution, my staff got it wrong here.

It is a bill that I hope to have many Members on when we come back next year. It is patterned after an event that took place on December 20, 134 years ago on December 20, in the first year of the War Between the States, the Civil War. The House and the Senate established a committee called simply, it sounds very modern, a Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, meaning the Civil War.

They did not trust Abraham Lincoln or his military experience to conduct the war without constitutional Senate and House oversight. Yet, he had been a captain in the Blackhawk Regiment; had engaged, although not in severe combat, in a home protection operation in the Indian Wars in Indiana and Illinois, his part of the country; and, it goes without saying that the current occupant of the Oval Office is no Abraham Lincoln, a man of towering character who when we quoting from Holy Scripture, we knew it was coming not only from his brain but his heart.

So, if this Congress in 1861 on December 20 would form a joint committee to oversee the war, I am putting in a House concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to oversee the conduct of Operation Joint Endeavor/Task Force Eagle.

I have already spoken to the Speaker about it and to the chairmen of some of our ranking committees here that have oversight of foreign affairs: The Committee on International Relations and the Committee on National Security, and I think that we should do that to make sure that we have that exit strategy that has still not been pointed out to us at the House.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to put in the letter of a colonel, an Army colonel, who won the Distinguished Service Cross. That is usually a medal of honor without enough eyewitnesses. He was a Bataan death march survivor and he wrote an open letter, simply titled "Memorandum for Record" on September 7, 1992.

Mr. Speaker, every major newspaper, all the networks, and PBS and the Wall Street Journal rejected this letter. Only the great Washington Times in this city printed it. It is by Col. Eugene Holmes, and I would like to ask per-

mission that that letter be put in the RECORD.

It was a delayed response, delayed by many years, from 1969 to 1979, to 1989, to 1992, 23 years later. He was responding to a letter by Oxford student Bill Clinton, a letter that Mr. Clinton had written December 3, 1969. I would like to ask unanimous consent to put Colonel Holmes' 23-year-after-the-fact letter to the Nation in, and then follow with the text of Bill Clinton's letter to this colonel when he was on active duty.

Mr. Speaker, this picture hangs in the front of my office. It is the first thing visitors see as they come through the door that the citizens from the 46th District of California have graciously elected this Member of Congress to represent.

It says at the top Normandy. It has the flags of the major participants: Canada, the United States, the Union Jack of Great Britain, and the French Tricolor. Our Old Glory is in the middle, but we suffered as we know most of the casualties because Omaha Beach, one of the five beaches, was the toughest.

There is copy at the bottom of this and I would like to read it as I close out of duty, honor, country, and dedicate it not only to all the veterans of my dad's war, where he was wounded three times, World War I, and all the World War II veterans that this specifically represents, closing out the last year of World War II, and this the last speech of 1995, the 50th anniversary year, but to dedicate it to all the young men and women who served in Vietnam particularly, because they still are disrespected by the likes of Oliver Stone and by even the current Commander in Chief, who would not use the word Vietnam when he named every other hot spot in the world and every other past conflict of this country, as a rationale for putting young men and women in harm's way in the Balkans.

□ 1630

But Vietnam, Korea, Grenada, Panama, forgive me if I leave something out, Desert Shield and Storm, everybody who serves on active duty anywhere in the world, from our furthest-flung radar sites up in Greenland down to those Navy pilots that I flew with 2 years ago next month down in Antarctica.

The beautiful framer of this picture, Thomas O. Nichols wrote to me this Veterans Day, November 11, 1995. We close the 50th anniversary of World War II. I was not able to do this that day.

There is no other Member of the House or Senate I would make this request to other than you, sir. And he says some nice things about my passion. Then he says, As you know, this Normandy print is the official print for the World War II commission and is recognized in Europe, Canada, and the United States. I would greatly appre-

ciate it if you would read the words under the Normandy print hanging in your front office, if you would read it on the floor. There would be no finer compliment offered to the men and women of the European theater than to have you read it for the record. My deep thanks are extended, if in fact the request is possible. In closing, this airborne ranger shares your love of country and no matter what the future brings to you and your family, he then says some nice things.

I am sorry I did not do it on the day that found my dad relieved, as he used to tell me, he had a prayer, Lord, take me to heaven, do not maim me or burn me. That was his World War I simple prayer of a young man that was ready to die for his country but like all young men was asking God if the chance of terrible wounds would be passed from them. I should have brought the copy to read from, but I am going to have to read it right from the print itself.

It says, Utah Beach, Point du Hoc, Omaha Beach, Gold Beach, Juno Beach, Sword Beach. On the morning of June 6, the combined allies forces, under the command of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, began the most dramatic military operation in the history of warfare. The invasion to free Europe was on and at H-Hour 0630 Operation Overload hurled 5,000 ships, thousands of support craft, 1,100 aircraft and nearly 200,000 men against Hitler's vaunted Atlantic wall. Out of the night came the paratroopers, including our SAM GIBBONS, Democrat of this current Congress, came the paratroopers out of night to secure the fields. From the chilled gray mist of H-Hour came the landing craft, ushering thousands of brave young men into the frigid waters along the 31-mile stretch of the Normandy coastline. Rangers climbed the cliffs of Point du Hoc to secure a foothold for freedom. This commitment to victory was accomplished by Allied leadership, more than a year of deception, the brilliance of British cypher-brakers and the heart of every individual soldier illuminating the dawn of what will forever be known as D-Day.

Every man that scaled those cliffs or hit those hallowed sands, never would they have dreamed that we would be there guarding Europe for the rest of this entire century and that 41 years later, we would still be sending young men in harm's way to stop Europeans from slitting one another's throats and, as the Pope said, sniping to death one another's children in the name of some sort of ethnic purity.

On the other half of the gilded 50th anniversary emblem over a large Purple Heart, it talks about the 50th anniversary, which I was lucky enough to attend a year and a half ago.

And it says: On the morning of June 6, 1994, a soft breeze danced along the coast of Normandy carrying the spirit of the fallen, the missing and the veterans back home who could not be with us. Orders came from above to fall in,

stand tall and share the grandeur of the 50th anniversary rollcall. By God's side, they assembled. The men walked at an honored pace and they wept with pride for their gum-chewing, got-a-smoke buddies who are gone but not forgotten. They hugged and shook the hands of strangers, never to be considered less than their fellow warriors. Wives, widows, children and grandchildren listened to the testimonies with humble respect. Noble words were spoken by officials, dignitaries, presidents, prime ministers and the Queen of England. Yet nothing of this day was to compare with the deeds of these men, for it belongs only to them. A footnote to history, in spirit the men of Operation Jubilee and the men of Exercise Tiger were there with us also.

Tiger was the event weeks before when German E-boats had killed almost 900 Americans who were practicing to offer their lives this day. It was kept secret for 20 years and so their memory is hard to conjure up in the historical recall of Americans who otherwise would have respected them so much. Operation Jubilee is another one of those failed operations earlier from which we learned so much to preserve as much life as we could in finally bringing the fight home to Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go up to the leadership table for the second part of my special order on the protection of innocent human life. Before I do, I would like to point to the cloisonne pin that I wear for the First Armored Division out of Bombholder, Germany and tell all the families, including one of our young staffers who said his best friend who is a second lieutenant in Old Ironsides, the First Division, who fought its way up through Italy and then fought so effectively on the left flank of the four-day miraculous, only 4-day land war in Desert Storm, he has had to put off his marriage. I wonder how many marriages were delayed, how many leaves were canceled to come home at Christmas time that had been planned by young fiances and young husbands and young brides. How many people could have been saved a lot of anguish by just delaying this operation a week, particularly since God had delayed it with weather the first week.

If BOB DOLE, our great leader in the other Chamber, does go over there in the next few days right after Christmas, and he is still contemplating it, I hope he will take me with him. I am leaving the floor to go over there after this special order and beg him to take a fellow presidential candidate with him. It will be a good message to send to our men and women in the field that, yes, of course we support the troops.

BOB DOLE, who does not like the operation but voted begrudgingly to back up Clinton, this Member, who if I had not been undercut by some leadership here, would have easily won a House vote to cut off all money to support this operation when Europeans, Euro-

peans should be handling the ground since we handled the airlift, the sealift, all the air power almost, the sea power, the food, the medicine, all the fuel and 99 to 100 percent of all the intelligence, why do we have to go into the fog and the mines and the 4 foot snow drifts now on what will be probably not a mild winter like last year but the usual severe Balkan winter that troops fought in in World War II.

Why do we have to go on the ground again ending this century near Sarajevo where it began with the slaughter of millions and millions of people which began with the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand by a Bosnian Serb teenager on June 28, 1914.

So I end this part of Duty, Honor, and Country, for those who served in the past, who still serve with the pain of their wounds that have not fully healed, and for those wonderful servicemen and women around the world, go up to the leadership desk and take up the slaughter of the innocents and tell a story about a doctor, not a doctor, an abortionist who is buried near my parents, and I hope it was a real burial and not a fast one upon the Catholic Church and the people at Holy Cross Cemetery in Culver City.

INCHES FROM INFANTICIDE ABORTION

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in California, while we were debating what I have decided to call inches from infanticide abortion, what my wife calls gangster execution style abortion, what my oldest son, Robert Kenneth Dornan, Jr. Calls coup de grace abortion, what the heroic Senator from New Hampshire calls partial birth abortion, as did our fine second-term Congressman from Florida, Mr. CANADY, here in the House call it second-term abortion. I will call it inches from infanticide murder abortion. Listen to this story about a specialist in this style of killing.

Specialist in late term abortions buried with Catholic rites, Los Angeles. Dr. James Timothy McMahon, one of two abortionists in the United States who specializes in partial birth, coup de grace abortions, died on October 28, right during the week of our debate on this issue. The Senate debated it on December 2. By the way, the House vote, Mr. Speaker, was 288 to 139. The Senate vote was 54 to 44. Think of that 44 and think of that 139. If you are a loyal stumbling, sinning, practicing Catholic, like myself, think that in the 15 Republicans who voted for this coup de grace execution style abortion, there were three people who have Catholic in their biography. On the Democratic side, there were 36 Democrats on the other side out of the 139 who have in their biography, Catholic.

Now, the House, on November 1, 3 days, All Saints Day, 3 days after the death of James Timothy McMahon voted to ban this. On November 8 the Senate voted to refer it, and then on December 2, thanks to BOB SMITH and a few other heroes in the other Chamber, brought it back and defeated it by 10

votes. It should have been defeated unanimously.

To the surprise of many Catholics, McMahon, who described performing abortions as his passion and admitted to performing 1,200 abortions annually since 1972, 23 years, tens of thousands of abortions, he was buried in Holy Cross Cemetery in Los Angeles on November 4.

Mr. Speaker, that is my parents' burial cemetery. My mother, my father, my grandmother, Katy McDonough McFadden, my uncle Jack Haley, my great aunt who was born on New Year's Day, who holds down that generation still very much alive, has her name already inscribed, Florence next to her beloved Jack's name, next to him is his mom Nellie Haley, right three graves away is Dixie Crosby. When I looked at it the other day, shocked me, she died at 41. First funeral I ever went to in my life with my friend Gary, the other three Crosby boys.

Gary Cooper up on the edge of the hill in front of the grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes. This last trip two Sundays ago I noticed for the first time Rita Hayworth, Jimmy Durante, Macdonald Carey, I still remember him as a child playing the 1F-4F hell cat, wildcat pilot in Wake Island, a classic World War II film, a great actor worked right up until cancer took him. I look at this famous cemetery, Bela Lugosi not 5, 5, maybe 4 graves from my parents' plot. And over this two streets in the section called Holy Martyrs, section cc, last month on November 4th is this abortionist buried.

I sincerely pray that the extreme unction, the last rites of his Christian faith were a take, but there is suspicion, maybe not, that it was all some sort of sham by a grieving sister. He died after receiving the last rites of his church, said Father Pat, well, I will not give Father Pat's last name. He is an American citizen of only 6 months, Mr. Speaker, born in Kilkenny, Ireland, where the great Saint Kenneth comes from, my middle name.

□ 1745

He said he was in no position to give details about McMahon's final repentance or reconciliation with his Catholic faith, but, before dying, he did establish the James McMahon Fund.

Now, a person who works at the abortion clinic told me he renounced his life of abortion killing, and yet the James McMahon Fund is not to advance the cause of protecting innocent human life at the beginning. It is a fund at the National Abortion Federation here in Washington to support access to legal abortion. Memorial donations can be made to the National Abortion Federation or to the Surgical Clinic in Los Angeles, one of two facilities that Dr. McMahon ran with his partner, also with an Italian-American name, presupposing, maybe, he was an altar boy at one time as McMahon bragged he was.

The National Abortion Federation, started in 1977, my first year in this

House; it is a trade association—I love that, I do not love it, I hate it—for abortion providers. And the summer before he died, McMahon, 57, worked hard to mobilize the abortion establishment to fight this Congress and our attempts to outlaw the coup de grace, execution style, a few inches from infanticide murder abortion procedure which he specialized in and charged up to—grab onto you seat, Mr. Speaker—charged \$8,000 to perform.

McMahon described himself as an altar boy and admitted baptizing babies he aborted, if the parents wished it to be done. Is this a messianic complex this man had?

In a 1990 interview by Karen Tumulty, of *NEWT GINGRICH'S Man of the Year* Time magazine cover, Karen Tumulty, and I have been trying to cross paths with her to discuss this 1990 article I remember reading at the time, wrote that McMahon had reconciled his gruesome practice with his conscience and his religious beliefs, noting that the abortionist is still attending mass occasionally. In my denomination "occasionally" does not cut it, but better once a year, twice, Christmas, Easter, than not at all.

"I've always been a classic liberal," he confessed. "I believe in freedom in the broadest sense." He had the freedom to hold the baby's head in the birth canal as you suck its brains out. "I frankly think the soul or personage comes in when the fetus is accepted by the mother."

How is that for a little personal philosophy, Mr. Speaker? The mother, to use a medieval term, ensoulment, the mother ensouls the baby with a thought. "I want you; you now have a soul."

So, tomorrow, if she changes her mind because the abortion industry is beating on her, and all the networks are saying how wonderful it is to finish your schooling or get a new washing machine or a new Mustang convertible, to abort that child, and you decide to cave in, is it too late? Should NARL ask people now, "Did you ensoul your baby by saying you wanted it at any time in the early stage of your pregnancy?" What a pompous, heretical philosophy.

He said—he spoke with pride about his abortion skills:

"Frankly, I don't think, I was any good at all until I had done 3,000 or 4,000," he told Karen Tumulty, then with the *L.A. Times*.

He would never hire abortionists to work in his facility unless they performed at least 600. That gives new meaning to the numerical game we all play with the White House, when a part-time, one-time abortionist who said it was wrong, nice man, Dr. Foster, lost the Surgeon General's job on one-twentieth of this figure, that you have to have 600 notches in your belt, he says, before you come to work for him.

"There is a great deal of craft in this procedure," the partial birth, execution-style, coup de grace abortion.

Mr. Speaker, he was in demand as a speaker at abortion conferences where he explained his field of expertise. He put his medical knowledge into layman's terms, however, when he told Tumulty how he performed the abortion which she described as follows. This is Karen writing about McMahon:

"McMahon has developed his own method which he calls intrauterine cranial decompression," translation Crushing the skull, cranial decompression.

He arranges the fetus so that he can remove it feet first. Before the skull emerges, he "collapses" it by inserting a three-millimeter instrument known as a cannula and extract its fluid. By keeping the fetus intact, he says he runs less risk of internal injury to the woman. "I want to deal with the head last, because that is the biggest problem," he adds levelly, "from my point of view, the fetus is a potential problem to the patient."

But then, if the parents want, he will baptize it.

Although McMahon did not allude to it, there was also a legal problem. According to legal experts, when the legs and body of a baby have emerged from the birth canal, they are legally protected.

What? Legally protected legs and arms? Yes, because if you cut an arm off, you go to jail like the guy that tore the arm off little Rosa, who appeared on Phil Donahue's strange show at age 4, beautiful child.

He said, "The legal border, however, is the neck." Therefore, if any killing is done, it must be done in utero.

So, you got protected arms and legs, Mr. Speaker, but get that head while it is still in utero.

During debates in the House of Representatives on November 1 and in the Senate on November 7 and 8, and then finally successfully since this article on December 1, supporters of this partial birth abortion defended the procedure as an emergency treatment for women in difficult pregnancies.

On Nightline Senator BOB SMITH, New Hampshire, was brilliant against another Senator who will remain anonymous because of House rules, when he said, "Wait a minute. If the mother is in distress, why does the doctor hold the head in there until he has taken out all the brain?"

And then this Senator spoke in circles, and then SMITH came back again, and finally Ted Koppel interrupted and said, "Senator, you do your position no good," he said to the woman, "unless you answer this question. You leave your supporters dangling."

They were left dangling.

As McMahon explained to *West* magazine, published by the *San Jose Mercury News*, the partial birth abortion procedure takes many days.

In simple terms, reporter David Early wrote,

McMahon floods the cervix with laminaria, a seaweed fluid that gently enlarges the canal while sharing the fetus. This process takes several days until the fetus can be slipped out of the lower uterus intact.

Usually the head of a late fetus is too large to fit through the cervix, so he uses the nee-

dle to extract just enough fluid from the head to slip it out.

The total time for the operations is generally about 52 hours.

This Christian paper I am reading from, the *Wanderer*, made several attempts to obtain a statement from the Archdiocese of Los Angeles which would explain why Dr. McMahon was entitled to a Catholic burial in the Holy Martyr section of the Holy Cross Cemetery, but various official spokesmen were unable to provide an explanation. Finally my friend, Roger Cardinal Mahoney, said, "I can't check the background of everybody on something like this."

Well, here is an article from Cardinal Hickey's *Catholic Standard* last week, Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, a writer I am not familiar with, Gerard Perseghin. Gerard interesting. That is the patron saint of pregnant women, of mothers-to-be, of mothers.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left? I want to pace this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Perseghin titles his Christmas season article "A Gruesome Reality."

"Over the years, I have been moved by mothers telling tearful stories of how their daughters died getting abortions, legal ones. And now the pro-life front has alerted us to the horrors of partial birth," execution-style, coup de grace, seconds from infanticide, inches from infanticide abortion.

"In the 22 years I have been writing stories about the pro-life movement since *Roe v. Wade* made abortions legal, nothing quite compares with this episode of legal abortion history." Herodean.

"The House of Representatives voted last month."

"Helen Alvare, spokeswoman for the U.S. Bishops on pro-life issues, pointed out that this procedure crosses the line between abortion and infanticide."

"The most eloquent description comes from a registered nurse, Brenda Pratt Shafer, a self-described pro-choice person." Her testimony is chilling. We have heard it on this floor many times. I will not repeat it, in the interest of time, but I will ask that this whole article be put in the *RECORD* at this point.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the *Catholic Standard*, Dec. 7, 1995]

A GRUESOME REALITY

(By Gerard Perseghin)

Over the years, I have been moved by mothers telling tearful stories of how their daughters died getting abortions, legal ones.

And now, the pro-life front has alerted us to the horrors of partial-birth abortions

In the 22 years I've been writing stories about the pro-life movement since *Roe v. Wade* made abortion legal, nothing quite compares with this episode of legal abortion history. The House of Representatives voted last month on a bill to outlaw partial-birth abortions. Now it is the Senate's turn this week, and I hope they do likewise. Numerous authorities like Helen Alvare, spokeswoman

for the U.S. bishops on pro-life issues, have pointed out that this procedure "crosses the line between abortion and infanticide."

The most eloquent description comes from a registered nurse, Brenda Pratt Shafer, a self-described pro-choice person. The nurse who claims to have participated in three partial-birth abortions with doctors who pioneered the procedure described it this way as performed on a third trimester baby boy:

The abortionist "delivered the baby's body and the arms—everything but the head. The doctor kept the baby's head just inside the uterus. The baby's little fingers were clasp- ing and unclasp- ing, and his feet were kick- ing. Then the doctor stuck the scissors through the back of his head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinch, a startled reac- tion, like a baby does when he thinks that he might fall. The doctor opened up the scis- sors, stuck a high-powered suction tube into the opening and sucked the baby's brains out. Now the baby was completely limp."

This is attacking human life, little human beings, when they are at their most vulner- able, grasping for life, for a hand to help them see the light of day and join the human race.

It is ludicrous that the child's head is left inside the mother for purely technical rea- sons. If the child were fully outside the mother, it would be murder. As it is, the pro- cedure can still be classified technically as abortion. But we know better. The Alan Guttmacher Institute, the expert source for abortion data, claims 164,000 abortions a year are performed after the first three months of pregnancy. Pro-abortion groups say "only" 600 of these partial birth abortions are per- formed each year, but the national Right to Life Committee says "the practices of Dr. Martin Haskell and the late Dr. James McMahon alone would approximate that fig- ure . . ."

Pro-choice types like to argue that many of these fetuses are dead before the proce- dure. Dr. Haskell who has performed them estimates that about two-thirds are alive, and they do feel pain. Anesthesia given to the mother doesn't affect the child as much. There is no basis in scientific fact to think the child doesn't feel the pain and is dead, said the American Society of Anesthesiol- ogists testifying before the Senate judiciary Committee in mid-November.

In a breakdown submitted to a House sub- committee, Dr. McMahon said of 175 partial- birth abortions he performed, the largest sin- gle category, 39 cases, were for "depression" on the part of the mother. Another nine were for cleft palate. In 1993 Dr. Haskell said 80% of the "extraction" procedures are "purely elective."

Furthermore, a member of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Asso- ciation itself has said the partial-birth abor- tion is not a recognition medical technique and called it "repulsive."

Partial-birth abortions also send the cruel- est of messages to people with disabilities struggling with demeaning attitudes. Alvare said, "Are we now going to tell persons with disabilities that a method of abortion consid- ered gruesome even by its supporters is saved especially for them?"

Partial-birth abortion, as she said, "vio- lates everything that is good, everything held dear in the human person . . ."

I will just finish her statement. The little baby's hands grasp. The doctor sticks the scissors into the back of the head, execution style. Baby's arms jerked out in a flinched style reaction like a baby does when he thinks he might fall. The doctor jams open the scissors and then sticks a high-powered

suction tube into the opening and sucks the baby's brains out. Now the baby was completely limp.

This is attacking human life, little human beings, when they are at their most vulnerable, grasping for life, for a hand to help them see the light of day and become part of the human race, or already part of it. It is ludicrous that the child's head is left inside the moth- er for technical legal reasons. If the child were fully outside the mother, of course it is murder. It is a procedure that can still be classified technically as an abortion. We know better.

The Alan Guttmacher Institute, very liberal, Mr. Speaker, which is not the expert source for the liberal media for abortion data, says there are 164,000 abortions a year performed after the first 3 months of pregnancy, 164—let us see. We lost 33,629 in Korea, we lost 48,000 overall, with the accidents in- cluded. We lost in Vietnam, with acci- dents included, 47,700—some in combat, another 10 accidents. We still have not reached 164. Let us throw in the 53,000 combat deaths in World War I, not the pneumonias, and you are getting close to the this figure.

World War I, Korea, Vietnam, and you would still have to throw in some of the millions that died of pneumonia in World War I. This is incredible. You can easily throw in everybody killed in Desert Storm, Grenada, Panama, and it is amazing, and we do this every year. I am talking about wars like Vietnam that took 10 years. They are performed after the first 3 months.

Pro-abortion groups say only every time they give that figure, only, and they say there is only 600 of these par- tial birth abortions performed each year. If McMahon took credit for half, I guess that leaves Dr. Martin Haskell, who refused to testify at the Senate hearing after they voted to table it No- vember 8, last month, but he is still a big mouth on this.

He says that he would approximate that figure, 600, and he said that two- thirds of them are alive, that this lie about the anesthesia is wrong, that most of them are elective. Now we have the American Society of Anesthesiol- ogists in a George Will column saying this is baloney, that enough anesthesia knocks out the little baby.

McMahon said of the 175 partial-birth abortions he performed recently, the largest single category, 39 cases, were for the depression of the mother. I wonder how depressed they are when they see it being debated in the U.S. House and Senate, and big margins, although they should have been bigger like the ones I have given. He said 39 for depres- sion. Nine were for cleft palate.

Do you know one of the more excit- ing Presidential candidates, Mr. Speak- er, had a cleft palate, one associated with the beautiful Rainbow Coalition? God loves him.

Do you know that two of our best speakers on the House floor, one of them that is terrific in that well with special orders, from parts of middle

America, that he had a cleft palate that has been perfectly repaired; that I know of at least two or three other people, including Johnny Cochran, who so shamefully twisted the truth to de- fend a double killer, he, you can tell from this mustache, survived and had repaired a cleft palate. But nine of these mothers said no, no cleft palate, kill the baby. Even in the 7th, the 8th, the 9th month.

Haskell, who is still alive, said 80 per- cent of the extraction procedures are purely elective. Partial-birth abortion, says one of the lady heads of the Coun- cil on Legislation of the American Medical Association, it violates every- thing that is good, everything held dear in a human person.

I saved this for last.

Do you know what took the life of abortion James Timothy McMahon, Mr. Speaker, buried in the Holy Martyr section near my parents? A malignant brain tumor, 3 days before we started debate, on the very day some of our misguided leaders were trying to stop those of us in this House who probably call ourselves pro-life, trying to stop us from bringing pictures to the well.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if I may put in the RECORD two articles: "Fanatics for Choice" by our friend, George Will, a beautiful article talking about how Americans are beginning to recoil against the fanaticism that has helped to produce this fact, more than a quar- ter of all American pregnancies are ended by abortions; and then the letter from the Life Issues Institute on six is- sues, and I will xerox this for the staff after I am through, on six things that are going to probably affect our August convention in San Diego next year:

[From Newsweek, Dec. 11, 1995]

FANATICS FOR 'CHOICE'—PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTIONS, SONOGRAM PHOTOS AND THE IDEA THAT 'THE FETUS MEANS NOTHING'

(By George F. Will)

Americans are beginning to recoil against the fanaticism that has helped to produce this fact: more than a quarter of all Amer- ican pregnancies are ended by abortions. Abundant media attention has been given to the extremism that has tainted the right-to- life movement. Now events are exposing the extraordinary moral evasions and callous- ness characteristic of fanaticism, prevalent in the abortion-rights lobby.

Begin with "partial-birth abortions." Pro- abortion extremists object to that name, preferring "intact dilation and evacuation," for the same reason the pro-abortion move- ment prefers to be called "pro-choice." What is "intact" is a baby. During the debate that led to House passage of a ban on partial- birth abortions, the right-to-life movement was criticized for the sensationalism of its print advertisements featuring a Dayton nurse's description of such an abortion:

"The mother was six months pregnant. The baby's heartbeat was clearly visible on the ultrasound screen. The doctor went in with forceps and grabbed the baby's legs and pulled them down into the birth canal. Then he delivered the baby's body and the arms— everything but the head. The doctor kept the baby's head just inside the uterus. The baby's little fingers were clasp- ing and un- clasp- ing and his feet were kicking. Then the doctor stuck the scissors through the back of

his head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinch, a startle reaction, like a baby does when he thinks that he might fall. The doctor opened up the scissors, stuck a high-powered suction tube into the opening and sucked the baby's brains out."

To object to this as sensationalism is to say that discomfiting truths should be suppressed. But increasingly the language of pro-abortion people betrays a flinching from facts. In a woman's story about her chemical abortion, published last year in *Mother Jones* magazine, she quotes her doctor as saying, "By Sunday you won't see on the monitor what we call the heartbeat." "What we call"? In partial-birth abortions the birth is kept (just barely) partial to preserve the legal fiction that a baby (what some pro-abortion people call "fetal material") is not being killed. An abortionist has told *The New York Times* that some mothers find such abortions comforting because after the killing, the small body can be "dressed and held" so the (if pro-abortionists will pardon the expression) mother can "say goodbye." *The New York Times* reports, "Most of the doctors interviewed said they saw no moral difference between dismembering the fetus within the uterus and partially delivering it, intact, before killing it." Yes.

Opponents of a ban on partial-birth abortions say almost all such abortions are medically necessary. However, an abortionist at the Dayton clinic is quoted as saying 80 percent are elective. Opponents of a ban on such abortions assert that the baby is killed before the procedure, by the anesthesia given to the mother. (The baby "undergoes demise," in the mincing words of Kate Michelman of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Does Michelman say herbicides cause the crab grass in her lawn to "undergo demise"? Such Orwellian language is a sure sign of squeamishness.) However, the president of the American Society of Anesthesiologists says this "misinformation" has "absolutely no basis in scientific fact" and might endanger pregnant women's health by deterring them from receiving treatment that is safe.

Opponents of a ban say there are only about 600 such procedures a year. Let us suppose, as not everyone does, the number 600 is accurate concerning the more than 13,000 abortions performed after 21 weeks of gestation. Still, 600 is a lot. Think of two crashes of jumbo airliners. Opponents of the ban darkly warn that it would be the first step toward repeal of all abortion rights. Columnist John Leo of *U.S. News & World Report* says that is akin to the gun lobby's argument that a ban on assault weapons must lead to repeal of the Second Amendment.

In the prophecy born of hope, many pundits have been predicting that the right-to-life "extremists" would drastically divide the Republican Party. But 73 House Democrats voted to ban partial-birth abortions; only 15 Republicans opposed the ban. If the ban survives the Senate, President Clinton will probably veto it. The convention that nominated him refused to allow the Democratic governor of Pennsylvania, Bob Casey, who is pro-life, to speak. Pro-choice speakers addressed the 1992 Republican Convention. The two presidential candidates who hoped that a pro-choice stance would resonate among Republicans—Gov. Pete Wilson, Sen. Arlen Specter—have become the first two candidates to fold their tents.

In October in *The New Republic*, Naomi Wolf, a feminist and pro-choice writer, argued that by resorting to abortion rhetoric that recognizes neither life nor death, pro-choice people "risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of

human life." Other consequences of a "lexicon of dehumanization" about the unborn are "hardness of heart, lying and political failure." Wolf said that the "fetus means nothing" stance of the pro-choice movement is refuted by common current practices of parents-to-be who have framed sonogram photos and fetal heartbeat stethoscopes in their homes. Young upscale adults of child-bearing age are a solidly pro-choice demographic group. But they enjoy watching their unborn babies on sonograms, responding to outside stimuli, and they read "The Well Baby Book," which says: "Increasing knowledge is increasing the awe and respect we have for the unborn baby and is causing us to regard the unborn baby as a real person long before birth. . . ."

Wolf argued for keeping abortion legal but treating it as a matter of moral gravity because "grief and respect are the proper tones for all discussions about choosing to endanger or destroy a manifestation of life." This temperate judgment drew from Jane Johnson, interim president of Planned Parenthood, a denunciation of the "view that there are good and bad reasons for abortion." So, who now are the fanatics?

[From the Life Issues Connector, December 1995]

QUESTIONS NEEDING ANSWERS

General Powell has withdrawn from the race but he leaves behind several unanswered questions. These questions were publicly posed by Bill Bennett in a column in the *Wall Street Journal* (G. Seib 10/18/95) and in a letter to Paul Weyrich, 10/13.

They were made in support of a Powell candidacy but are now moot in that regard. However, the questions will be heard again and again in the coming year. The reason is that these arguments were given nation-wide play by a number of nationally syndicated columnists, and not well answered by them. Further and most importantly, we will see these arguments used by others right up to the election.

1. The first voiced criticism is of pro-life tactics as unsuccessful and, as yet, not stopping the devastatingly high number of abortions in America. But, let us not forget that, although there remain 1.5 million abortions annually, without the pro-life opposition, there would likely be half again as many babies being killed today.

Certainly the dramatic drop in numbers of facilities doing abortions and the number of abortionists doing them is a clear result of pro-life efforts. Perhaps the greatest accomplishment in the US as compared to many western nations, is that abortion is still looked upon by the general public as a bad thing. The label "abortionist" is still a term of condemnation. This climate is and will be of vast importance in some day turning this around.

The reason for the failure to limit abortions is not the pro-life movement, but the members of the US Supreme Court. Would Powell have appointed Supreme Court nominees who will reverse *Roe v. Wade*?—will Spector? Alexander? Forbes?

2. There was sharp criticism of maintaining the "chimera [fantastic scheme] of a constitutional amendment" and that "this has done nothing to reduce the number of abortions." Of course we don't have a constitutional amendment, because we don't yet have two-thirds support in both houses of congress nor the majorities in the state houses to ratify it. However, a federal constitutional amendment to protect from conception must remain our ultimate goal, even though it is not likely to happen in the near future. It is not a chimera.

An intermediate goal is the reversal of *Roe Vs. Wade*, which, because of the Supreme

Court, is also currently not obtainable. One only has to look to the states to see progress in what has been allowed by the Supreme Court—parental notification, informed consent, waiting periods, no funding, etc. Rather, the true chimera would be a president who was pro-abortion, who would (if he chose to) work around the edges, trying to reduce the number of abortions. Everything that was mentioned might reduce the number of abortions, if aggressively carried out, by only 5% or 10%.

3. Another argument asked why pro-lifers won't accept the logical conclusion of putting women in jail. This area has been thoroughly investigated and documented. Throughout the entire history of the United States, when abortion was illegal and abortionists were jailed, not a single woman was even indicted for being an accomplice to an abortion. The woman has always been considered the second victim, not the perpetrator. If anyone implies that he thinks this should happen, he stands quite alone. No responsible leader in the pro-life movement supports this. Certainly no one in the pro-abortion movement or any legislators would advocate such a harsh treatment of women. This argument is fallacious, uncharitable and not worthy of serious discussion.

4. Have pro-lifers supported pro-abortion candidates in the past? Two instances have been cited when the National Right to Life Committee worked for pro-abortion candidates, US Senators Paul Coverdell and Kay Bailey Hutchison. This analogy fails badly by ignoring some very key factors in NRLC's decision. Certainly NRLC's strategy was controversial in some pro-life circles. However, that was another issue in itself. In each of the above instances, pro-lifers were faced with a very aggressive, pro-abortion candidate on one side, and a pro-abortion candidate on the other who was willing to support peripheral pro-life issues. Their decision was to support the lesser of two evils. This, however, was done after the primaries, when the candidates were in place. To argue this prior to the primaries, is an entirely different story. At this point, we still have the option of electing pro-life candidates in the primaries and in the general election.

5. Perhaps the strongest argument posed to pro-lifers in one we will hear again and again from the liberal media and from "personally opposed, but" candidates. It is expressed in the following. "It seems to me that there is something wrong with some pro-life advocates who embrace candidates when they pay lip-service to pro-life principles which lead to no real world actions. Frankly, I prefer a political leader who would not change the legality of abortion, yet who is also genuinely and deeply troubled by 1½ million abortions a year, eager to limit them, discourage them, and eventually end them, than a person who mouths the words and does little else to reduce the number of abortions."

This is cutting the question and in a rather unfair way. It sets up, on one extreme, a pro-abortion candidate who is eager to reduce abortions. On the other extreme, it sets up a pro-life candidate who intends to do nothing to reduce abortions. This is totally unrealistic. Who are these two candidates? By what dimension can anyone be reasonably confident that such a candidate occupies the first position? And who are those titular, pro-life candidates who will do nothing to stop it? Certainly not Dole, Gramm, Lugar, Buchanan, Gingrich, Keyes or Dornan. If one is to argue for such a candidate, such argumentation should involve at least a realistic picture of the candidate himself and the prospective alternatives.

For most pro-lifers who rule out a pro-abortion candidate for the presidency and the vice presidency, the bottom line is the

fact that there will almost certainly be appointments to the Supreme Court in the next presidential term. As previously mentioned, the ultimate goal of the pro-life movement is to protect babies in their mothers' wombs. An intermediate goal would be, at the least, to return that option to each state to decide. Neither of these will happen until the Supreme Court has a majority of justices who will allow this to happen. The president appoints these Supreme Court justices.

6. There are some who believe that none of the present Republican contenders can beat Clinton. Logic, therefore, drove them to support Powell who they thought could. But is the power of the presidency the only consideration?

In his letter of October 9, Dr. James Dobson gave one answer. He denounced Christian Coalition's Ralph Reed and also Bill Bennett for suggesting that they might back Colin Powell in the general election. "Is power the motivator of the Great Crusade? If so, it will sour and turn to bile in your mouth."

But more pragmatically, let's remember why cross-over Democrats, "Reagan Democrats," have voted for Republican presidential candidates in recent years. Keep in mind the deepseated mind-set that, "my father and grandfather always voted Democrat." Never forget, also, their same rejection of country club Republicans. It takes a paramount issue to get traditional Democrats to cross over and vote for a Republican candidate. The catalyst that has done this in recent years has been abortion and other family value issues. Nothing much less than a deepseated conviction on family value issues can get your average Reagan Democrat to again vote Republican. If they have a choice between a solid pro-abortion Democrat incumbent and a basically pro-abortion Republican challenger, who they suspect will betray them on family value issues, they're either going to stay in the Democrat column or they're going to go to the shopping center instead of the polls that day.

In the coming months the Republican party will have to decide whether to keep or change the pro-life plank in its platform. Again in the election campaign next fall, all these arguments will be repeated by the liberal media and by pro-abortion and "moderate" candidates.

Pro-lifers should be prepared. Our nation must decide if it wants to nominate someone who will build on the gains made in the 1994 November election, or someone who will temporize, split, and perhaps end up destroying it.

□ 1700

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would repeat my Christmas recital from last night, to end on a happy note. This is done in the spirit of the season. After all, the Oval Office had children in it the other day when the occupant talked about "It's a time for peace, not threats." And both of my California daughters called me, and my daughter here later and my sons, and said what is this, using the word threat in front of little children in the Oval Office? They think that means Lincoln and John F. Kennedy. They do not know it is a battle of words between Capital Hill and the other.

Let me give my Christmas recital. There are a lot of mistakes, since I gave them a bad copy last night. It is entitled, paraphrasing Clement Clark Moore's "The Night Before Christmas," it is entitled "A Visit From a Santa Imposter":

T'was the night before Christmas and all through this House,
the liberals were playing the cat and the mouse.

The budget was hung by threads of despair,
while we hoped and we prayed Bill Clinton would care.

The night before last, while snug in his bed,
visions of veto pens danced in Bill's head.
He dreamed of Webb Hubble all through the night

and vowed he would veto if only for spite.
While out in the land there arose such a clatter,
taxpayers demanding, just what is the matter?

Balance that budget, shut some Feds down.
Our poor Army's in Bosnia, they yelled with a frown.

The moon on the breast of last night's fallen ice
gave delusions of grandeur to Hillary; how nice.

When what to our wondering eyes should appear,
but Willie as Santa, his gang as reindeer,
passing out pork in Fed buckets and pails,
while frightening the old folks with MediScare tales.

More swooping than vultures his coursers they came,

Bill whistled and shouted and called them by name:

"Now Al Gore, Panetta, Moscow and Stephanie;
on Flowers, on Troopers, on Inhale and Betsy.

From the top of the heap to the top of the Hill,

now bash away, bash away, go for the kill!"
While back in the House the hurricane rages.
The freshmen are busy inspiring the pages
With sad words from ladies, and gentlemen too,

who would rather be home with an eggnog or two. . .

where children and grandchildren snuggle in bed,

waiting for Santa, the real one, in red.
But struggle we will until our promise is met,

a budget that's balanced; falling national debt.
A tax break for families with children to raise,

a gift to our Nation more conservative days.
And then in a twinkling we heard on this roof,
the stomping and pawing of each liberal hoof.

As the Speaker called order, we all turned around,

as he came through the cloakroom looking smug and quite round.

He was dressed all in glitter, Al says fur's not allowed.

He threw Big Macs and french fries all over our crowd.

"You have won now; it is over, I fear.

The budget is signed, my election draws near.

But if I should lose, I will still be around.

I'm goin' to Hollywood. It's my kind of town."

He plopped in his sleigh, to his libs gave a yell,

and then they were gone like spenders from hell.

But we heard him exclaim as they galloped 'cross heaven.

"Bob Dornan impeaching me? Film at eleven."

Have a merry Christmas down there in North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLBE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear herein after in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the chair.

□ 2400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DAVIS] at 12 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 22, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, December 22, 1995 at 6:15 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment H.J. Res. 136.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representative:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 22, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, December 22, 1995 at 7:10 p.m.:

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 394

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1878

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2627

that the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 106

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.