

There is a need for Members, all of us, to be thinking carefully about the messages that we send to the public, because if we say it enough times about ourselves, then after a while people begin to believe us. And the messages that go forth about this institution, Republican and Democrat alike sending them, I might add, I think have caused a lot of people to wonder.

The fact of the matter is that each of the Members who chose to run for this institution chose to run. And I believe deeply that Members who are here believe in what they are doing. It is in that capacity, then, that we need to make sure that we communicate the best of this institution as well as our constantly trying to change it.

I listened to a debate the other day on a contentious issue. It was not necessarily Republican or Democrat, it was just a very, very contentious issue. And I heard from both sides the charges back and forth of, well, this person is in the pocket of so-and-so, or this person who just spoke is speaking up for such-and-such a group. As it rang back and forth I thought how does this debate come across to those who are watching and listening. And the answer is these folks must know what they are talking about and maybe they are all in the pockets of so-and-so.

My feeling is, and I believe the way most people here feel, is that Members of Congress are not in the pockets of anybody and that they are here wrestling with some honest to goodness difficult questions.

I look around this Chamber and what I see in these seats is this is where the Nation comes together. This is the crossroads of the country and this is where the country comes to try to work out its problems. Somebody from California or someone who lives on the seacoast may not know what it is like to live up a mountain hollow in West Virginia. By the same token, I have to learn what it is like to live in many other parts of the country and the problems that are faced there, and sometimes that is a slow process and sometimes it requires a lot of deliberation. So it is a process of trying to come to a consensus and understand one another.

I will say this. This is probably about as divergent a Congress as I have ever had the privilege to serve in terms of political views, ranging from the extreme conservative to the extreme liberal. But I also know that the best hope that this country has is to be able to work this out within the confines of this institution. That is why it exists. It is called Congress. Congress means coming together. Obviously, with the divergent viewpoints we all have, it may take a little longer to come together.

We can have vigorous debate. We have to have that debate. We can have tough aggressive partisanship. But I also ask that we be thinking about respect for this institution. Because if we are truly leaders, and people elect us to

be leaders, then that means people are following our example. And if we are in here wrestling around and calling each other names, then I wonder whether or not that becomes the commonplace form or method of operation or mode of communication for those of our constituents. If it is okay for those folks in Congress, it must be okay for me.

There is a need for civility, an increased need for civility in our society today, and I think one place it needs to begin is here in Congress.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON TAKES EXTREME POSITION ON VETO OF PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am unapologetically pro-life. Recently we were joined by a number of our pro-choice colleagues in voting to outlaw partial birth abortions. Those folks also believed the procedure to be violent and gruesome and in no way consistent with their views that some abortions ought to be legal.

President Clinton, on the other hand, who has often said that he personally opposes abortion, says that he believes abortion ought to be legal but rare. In this particular instance I think he has finally shown his true colors. He has reached out to the most radical of the pro-abortion lobby by vetoing the partial birth abortion bill. The veto was a slap in the face to all of those who respect human life.

The President has shown once and for all that he favors abortion on demand, even in the final weeks of pregnancy, and that is a tragically extreme position.

I would remind my colleagues that the partial birth abortion ban was supported by 288 Members of this body, both Republicans and Democrats. Most thoughtful legislators did not consider the bill to be controversial and agreed it was something long overdue, a prohibition on a particularly grotesque and inhumane practice, yet the President did not see it that way.

Let us recap for a moment what it is we are talking about here. A partial birth abortion is performed by using forceps to pull a living baby, feet first, through the birth canal until the baby's body is exposed, leaving the head just within the uterus. The abortionist then forces surgical scissors into the base of the skull, creating an incision through which he then inserts a suction tube to evacuate the brain tissue from the baby. This causes the skull to collapse, allowing the baby to be pulled from the birth canal.

The Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act would outlaw such abortions. The President, who says that abortions should be rare, says that there is no question this is a gruesome procedure.

The President says that abortions should be rare, but he vetoed this particular legislation. I think that was outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I will say one thing for the President, however, he has been consistent. He says one thing and then does another. He promised to end welfare as we know it. He vetoed welfare reform. He promised the middle-class tax cut and then he vetoed the middle-class tax cut that was passed by this Congress. He said that abortion should be rare, but his record shows that he supports abortions on demand at any time for any reason.

I would agree with Robert Casey, the former Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, who said President Clinton says he wants abortions to be safe, legal, and rare, but he has helped make it safe, legal, and everywhere. Yesterday Cleveland Bishop Anthony Pilla, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, joined by eight American cardinals, sent an extremely thoughtful, strongly worded letter to President Clinton in response to the President's veto, and I would like to quote from that letter at this time.

In the letter the bishop stated as follows: Your veto of this bill is beyond comprehension for those who hold human life sacred. It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb.

And the letter goes on: At the veto ceremony, you told the American people that you had no choice but to veto the bill. Mr. President, you and you alone have a choice of whether or not to allow children almost completely born to be killed brutally in partial birth abortions. Members of both Houses of Congress made their choice. They said no to partial birth abortions. Your choice was to say yes and to allow this killing more akin to infanticide than abortion to continue.

That is what the Catholic bishops had to say to the President of the United States. It would be an understatement to say that I am disappointed and saddened by President Clinton's unconscionable veto of the partial birth abortion ban. I think my sentiments are shared by many, including a large number of people who consider themselves to be pro-choice, and I cannot stress in strong enough terms my hope that this Congress when it is given the opportunity will vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, we cast hundreds of votes in this body every year. This vote will not be forgotten and we hope that we override this terrible veto the President made.

#### TRIBUTE TO OUR FALLEN FRIEND, RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, later on this evening, the gentleman from New Jersey, DON PAYNE, and other Members of Congress will continue to pay tribute to my fallen buddy, Ron Brown, but I just want to share some views as I saw Ron and 33 other coffins arrive in Dover, these flag-draped coffins covering the bodies of people that were in the business of selling the United States of America, and then heard the tributes that were paid to all of them, as well as attending at Arlington cemetery.

As the bands were playing and the flags were unfurled and the cannons were blasting, I could only think what a great country we live in and how many things we just take for granted; that here a young American who comes from one of the poorest communities can, in such a short period of time, capture the love and gain the respect of not only the President of the United States but so many Americans from seashore to seashore, and, at the same time, to know that in so many foreign countries, some not as friendly as we wish that they would be, that they lowered their flags at half mast for this great American, Ron Brown.

I think that when we start thinking about loving America, we have to think about what kind of person could love his country so much that he would try to climb mountains that other people would not even attempt, not only to show how great America was and what products we wanted to sell, and not how superior we were, but to actually talk with trade ministers and prime ministers and presidents in terms of the needs of their country. The poverty, the disease, the sickness, the hunger, the unemployment, the joblessness, and to be able to say to that country that America was there as a friend that wanted to help.

This was a part of the world that we never spent that much time in. This was the part of the world that we had to develop markets in. This was the part of the world that we had to increase their ability to have disposable income so that as we had once done in Europe under the Marshall plan, that we could regain the leadership that we have possessed since World War II. And how they loved him, because it was not just selling America, it was the interest he had in them.

I saw at the funeral Ambassadors that had flown in from Mexico, India, South Africa. They spoke, they talked, they loved, they cared. And I said what a wonderful country it is that we have in the United States of America, people that come from every country in the world.

□ 1730

Unlike other countries where you just look at the country and you can feel just the narrow culture interest that they have, there is no country in the world that we cannot reach and show that Americans come from all over. To see what investing in the edu-

cation of a Ron Brown, or Ron Gonzalez, or Ron Lee, or the women that have been denied the opportunity to show, to be given the opportunity to show that they are Americans, this is a great country, and go abroad and find out that they are making friends for us, as well as creating trade.

Mr. Speaker, I have received notices, as well as telephone calls, from Senator DOLE and from Haley Barbor, who is the chair of the Republican Party, to say to me, as they have said to others, this issue is too big to look at party labels. It is too big to look at the color of American skins. It is American to be able to say that we can make our country a greater place, create more jobs if only we cared enough to train our people for these type of opportunities and to share our talents with so many other countries in the world.

#### RIGHTFUL ROLE OF GOVERNMENT TO DEFEND THE DEFENSELESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sentiments of my colleague from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I take the well today to talk a little bit about an issue I think that is of great and paramount importance to both sides of the aisle that serve in this august body. For the last 15 months, we have watched as the House of Representatives struggles with public policy questions. What is the rightful role of government? To what extent do we fund these programs? What programs work? What programs do not work?

For 15 months, it has been a very healthy, although at times contentious, debate. It gets at the very heart of what democracy is all about. Taking these issues to the American people, to the floor of the House of Representatives and having a good give and take. We are trying to understand, as we are on the threshold of a new millennium, where to take America. What are our priorities? And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that as we think about those priorities, we think about a government that most of us would like to be benevolent, caring, there for those who cannot help themselves.

We need to think of the question that gets at the heart of the highest, most precious part of the human experience, and I speak with reference to those moments when a young woman and her husband, a young man and wife, learn the terrific news that there is going to be a birth of a child. Their excitement, their love, their exhilaration is unmatched by almost anything else that one could experience in life, and I do not think there is an American, whether they be described as pro-choice or pro-life, that cannot appreciate that very important and most precious moment in the human experience.

It leaves me, Mr. Speaker, mystified, wondering if the rightful role of government is not to step forward, to indeed protect the most defenseless among us, that nurturing, growing life within the womb, that most precious experience in a woman's existence. What is the rightful role of government, I ask, if not to protect that defenseless life? Yet we had an issue, and I speak principally to the issue of the late-term partial birth abortion ban, and the question of government's rightful role to step in at a period when this baby, growing within the womb, is 4½ months along, or on the eve of a birth. Yet this procedure continues and will continue because a bill that was sent to the White House was rejected. Despite the safeguard stipulating that there must be an absolute threat to the life of the mother, the President chose to veto this bill. The same president who as Governor could have been at one point described as pro-life now sides with the radical left on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again, what is the rightful role of government if not to step forward at these most important moments to defend the defenseless, to step forward for our children? Is there anything so precious in life, in society as the birth of a child, as the potential growth of a new human life? And yet, this partial birth abortion procedure, which some say is a rare occasion, well, I would say one occasion is too many. There are, as I have been told, some very infrequent times when the life of the mother is so threatened that this procedure is performed. But I am also told that the American Medical Association, its college of legislative people and the 12 doctors therein, have said that this is an unnecessary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, as I yield the podium, I would just ask that if the rightful role of government is not to defend the defenseless, to defend precious life, then what is the role of government?

#### THE TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, here in Washington there was a public relations blitz organized by the administration to tell us and the world how United States trade relations with Japan have improved. National Economic Council Chair Laura Tyson went so far as to state we have had a great record of success with the Japanese in the area of trade with our exports increasing by one-third since 1993, and we have seen the trade deficit come down, she said, for the first time in 5 years, so we have a strong record of success.

Well, you know, people can twist numbers in amazing ways. If the administration had such a strong record of success, why has the United States trade deficit with Japan worsened during the Clinton watch and become even