

ALEXIS HERMAN—EXCELLENT CANDIDATE FOR SECRETARY OF LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Alexis Herman, who is the most appropriate person to head this country's Department of Labor. As many of my colleagues know, Mrs. Herman has spent much of her life preparing for this job. Almost 20 years ago, Mrs. Herman headed the women's division of the Department of Labor under President Carter and she has been building on that success ever since. Mrs. Herman has spent most of her working life as an advocate for minorities in businesses, including the corporate sector.

□ 1845

She has been an effective leader, and she has looked out for the interests of the working people of this country. Because of her efforts, this country is now a better place for business and for the workers. Mrs. Herman has done a great job heading the President's liaison office for the last 4 years, and she will do even a better job as heading the Department of Labor.

As an African-American and a woman, Mrs. Herman has overcome many obstacles in her rise to become one of the leading advocates for business and economic development in our country. I implore my colleagues in the Senate to confirm the nomination of Alexis Herman without delay.

Ms. Herman has earned our support and our confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] for a colloquy.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentlewoman from Florida has a fantastic story she would like to tell us about Ms. Alexis Herman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Recently in Eatonville, a little town in my district, a young lady came up to me and asked me did I know Mrs. Alexis Herman because she was from Mobile, AL. And speaking of family values, she told me about her mother who was the librarian in the little school there and taught them the importance of taking care of what they had since they did not have much. Her father was a community leader and sent best wishes to Ms. Alexis Herman. So when we talk about family values, it is important to understand that Alexis Herman comes from the kind of roots that has made this country great.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. Once in a while good people come into government, good people who base their decisionmaking on experience, good people who base their decisionmaking on the love of God and faith in

the people. Alexis Herman is that kind of person.

I stand to ask support of the Senate to confirm Ms. Alexis Herman. They could not find a better person, both from an educational point of view, from a professional point of view and from a personal point of view. They will find someone who is a team player, who will look through both parties, not one, who will look to the education of our children to be sure that they learn to work. She understands the work ethic. She understands labor. She is fair.

Mr. Speaker, to my dear colleagues, I think today this country and our wonderful Nation did itself proud in the U.S. Senate, because there was a very, very good and positive hearing about Alexis Herman's qualifications. I am very pleased that we are here today to say that. We have a person who understands. She is no ordinary person. She is no ordinary government worker. She is an extraordinary person who understands how to do ordinary things.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. EWING]. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members that they should refrain from referring to the confirmation proceedings in the Senate by advocating that it take certain action with respect to a Presidential nominee.

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

[Mr. GEKAS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to switch times with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION

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

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening my comments are going to be about a procedure that I did not even know existed as of 2 years ago, and that is called partial birth abortion. What is partial birth abortion? I think it is incumbent upon every citizen of this country, every American in this country to understand what that procedure is.

Now, let me explain it to my colleagues without trying to get too graphic. What it is, it is the abortion in the late term of a pregnancy. What do I mean by that and how does this procedure carry it out? What I mean is that in this country it is legal for a pregnant individual to go into the delivery room on delivery date, 9 months, upon delivery date and have that fetus aborted.

How is the procedure carried out? The baby is actually delivered feet first all the way out of the woman's body except for about 1 inch of the baby's head. At that point in time, a procedure is instituted which pierces the skull and, frankly, sucks the brains out of this individual. This is at 9 months or 8 months or 7 months. This is not the usual term of abortion as we think about it or hear about it. This procedure is actually performed not rarely, by the way. Even an advocate of this procedure admitted that he lied last year when he said that it was a rare procedure. It is a procedure that is performed on a fairly common basis.

Think of it in our country. We have some of the most advanced hospitals in the world. On one end of the hospital we will use whatever technology is available, whatever cash resources are necessary to save the life of a premature baby that on a lot of occasions may be no larger than your hand. On the other end of the hospital, a 9-month delivery, a regular delivery, no prematurity, a regular delivery, we allow under our laws in this country for any reason whatsoever for that child's life to be terminated, terminated through this procedure.

Some will tell us that this is a rare procedure, that it is a procedure performed for medical necessity.

Let me quote from C. Everett Koop: "I believe Mr. Clinton was misled by his medical advisors on what is fact and what is fiction on the matter," he said.

Such a procedure, he added, cannot truthfully be called medically necessary for either the mother or, he scarcely need point out, for the baby.

Dr. Romer, Dr. Smith, Dr. Cook and Dr. DeCook:

None of this risk is ever necessary for any reason. We and many other doctors across the United States regularly treat women whose unborn children suffer the same conditions as those cited by the women who appeared in the veto ceremony held a year ago by the President. Never is the partial birth procedure necessary.

Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal, Thursday April 25:

With capital punishment back in vogue, we ought to devise a modern method of execution for particularly fiendish criminals, the

Unabomber, if convicted of these diabolical acts of which he is suspected, for example. We have a modest proposal. Why not stick a catheter in his brain and suck it out until his skull collapses. We jest, of course. No one would think of doing this to another human being, even the Unabomber, but the President of the United States stands up four-square for doing to it babies still in the womb but nearing birth, vetoing Congress's attempt to ban this procedure in late term abortions. And of course he gets plaudits from all those eager to brand the Christian right or other abortion foes as extremists.

Let me say, the Wall Street Journal is not a pro-life publication. These columns, speaking of the Wall Street Journal, have never been part of the pro-life movement.

Lay aside the Unabomber, how about a baboon, for that matter a white rat? The Federal Government has extensive sets of rules and regulations on the humane treatment of animals in biomedical research. There are U.S. government principles on the utilization and the care of vertebrate animals, for example, and a Federal Animal Welfare Act. Each research institution must ponder these issues through a committee with at least one outside member representing the public. The regulations mandate "avoidance of minimization of discomfort, distress and pain," and specify "Surgical or other painful procedures should not be performed on unanesthetized animals paralyzed by chemical agents."

To the people of this country, to my colleagues in this Chamber, understand what partial birth abortion means. It is wrong. Understand that this procedure is not an abortion performed the day after intercourse takes place. This is a procedure that legally in this country can be performed 9 months after that intercourse takes place, on delivery date. It is important that we all support the ban on this procedure. It is wrong to allow it to happen in this country.

SUPPORT FOR NOMINATION OF ALEXIS HERMAN

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as most Americans know, March is the month for women. It is Women's History Month in the United States.

I first want to commend the five women in Aberdeen last week who came forward and recanted their stories that they had been raped by their drill sergeants. I think that was an outstanding tribute to women, and I think their courage for coming forth and telling the truth must be congratulated.

Today the Senate started their hearings for a fine African-American woman, Alexis Herman, to become the next Secretary of our Labor Department. We are almost in the second quarter of 1997. Nearly 3 months have passed and we do not have yet the President's nominee for the Department of Labor. I commend the Senate for beginning the hearings for Ms. Alexis Herman.

Ms. Herman, like me, is an African-American woman. Ms. Herman is a lover of education and is well documented and degreed like myself.

Ms. Herman is a civil rights activist for men and women, black and white in this country, and her record speaks for itself.

With all that said, that is not why I believe Alexis Herman ought to be confirmed. She is qualified. She is dedicated, and she will provide for this U.S. Labor Department what we need, which is a strong fighter for jobs, one who will make opportunities available for our young people, one who will give her best to see that our Labor Department reaches its goal of full employment in America.

I strongly support Ms. Herman. Her record of advancing programs for young people, for going that extra mile to develop creative, innovative work experiences for young and old, black and white, is to be commended.

Alexis Herman will make a fine Labor Secretary. Her hard work up to this time has proven that she is one who will take risks. She will speak out. She will look out for our young people and take care of our labor movement.

I urge my colleagues, all of us, to work together, to speak out, to see that this most important department in our government, the Labor Department, confirms this fine woman. What better tribute could we give to women in this country than to confirm Alexis Herman as our new Secretary of Labor?

EDUCATION AT A CROSSROADS

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, over the last few months we have been engaged in a process which we call Education at a Crossroads, visiting different parts of the country, visiting different school districts within my congressional district, getting feedback on the effectiveness, the quality, and the impact that Federal education programs have had.

There has been some dispute about some of the findings that we may have received, but what we have been hearing consistently is that there is significant room for improvement in how the Washington establishment, how the Federal bureaucracy delivers programs to the classroom, how we help kids at the local level.

A couple of weeks ago in Delaware, Bill Manning, the local superintendent of the Red Clay School District in Wilmington, DE, said he would rather see safe and drug free schools money go to academic programs of the district's choosing, asking for district flexibility. "It is time to ask ourselves whether the time we take out of the classroom for drug awareness programs is time well spent," he said.

He is looking for more flexibility to do for the kids in Wilmington, Delaware what they believe is most needed.

Mr. Carper, the Democratic Governor of Delaware, said, We must free the schools of regulations.

In California, Arizona, Delaware, we have heard time and time again that there are too many regulations associated with the hundreds of Federal programs that we have for education in America today. Marian Berguson, representative of Governor Wilson in California said, Federal requirements and dictates are stifling. That is not what we want in education at the local level. We want innovation; we want creativity, and we want results.

Lisa Graham Keegan, Arizona State Superintendent, noted that 8 percent of Arizona's education money comes from the Federal Government and that easily more than 50 percent of the work in the State Department and in the school district is a result of receiving this 8 percent of their money. Ten percent funds versus 50 percent of the paperwork? It does not make sense to me.

We are going to continue these hearings to get a better idea of exactly whether Federal programs are helping or whether they are hurting.

□ 1900

What is working and what is wasted in education in America today.

We are also engaged in another process. We are taking a look at somewhere in the neighborhood of 700, 800, maybe 900 Federal programs. There are some people who ask where do we come up with the number, and it is pretty tough because when we ask the executive branch they cannot give us one. But we went to a document which is called the Catalog of Federal and Domestic Assistance. For short, and this is about the only short thing there is associated with it, it is called the CFDA.

It is, very simply, if we go to the section marked education and go through the pages we find out that this document, which lists all Federal grant programs, take a look at this, all Federal grant programs, and the title under education lists about 660 programs.

We then went to the Congressional Research Service and said, "They tell us there are 660 programs. What do you think?" They went out and they came back and they said, "There are probably more. We have identified a total of 116 programs that might be added to the 661 programs that you already have identified." That puts us well over 750 programs.

They went on to say that we do not claim to have identified all Federal programs related to education, it is virtually impossible that this will be exhaustive, but we are aware of no better source of this information than the CFDA. So we know that there are the hundreds of programs. This is as we take a look and ask Federal agencies to identify it.

We then go out and we take a look at outside sources. What do outside sources say that we have in Federal education programs? This is an independent, outside, small little cottage