

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

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

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

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

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will vote on the very important issue of partial birth abortion. I would like to address that subject for a few minutes. I have practiced obstetrics and gynecology for more than 30 years and have delivered thousands of babies. I have never needed to, nor have I known of any circumstance where the partial birth abortion procedure was necessary for the health of the mother. Quite to the contrary, it is my most sincere conviction that the procedure itself is quite dangerous to the mother.

When it was first said by the right-to-life advocates that this procedure was being done frequently, I was reluctant to believe this possible, considering its danger and its grotesque nature. It was only after the admission by the proponents of abortion that, indeed, it was done frequently, and on healthy babies, that I was willing to consider that we had slipped to the point where this operation is promoted as an acceptable medical procedure.

The notion that this procedure should be available for the protection of the health of the mother is disingenuous to say the least. As a physician who encountered inter-uterine fetal death in the second and third trimester, I have never entertained the thought of performing this procedure because of the risk to the mother.

Using the mother's health as an excuse for abortion reminds me of what I witnessed in the 1960's as an obstetrical resident. Physicians defying the law were using an illegal loophole, saying that if an individual threatened suicide it was a justification for abortion. It was a matter of course to make a phone call and get a commitment from a sympathetic psychiatrist to say yes, he would sign the papers, and that is all it took.

It is one thing to defend abortion because one sincerely believes it should be legal, but it is another thing to distort the truth, fudge the statistics, and pretend that it is done for the health of the pregnant woman. This should be exposed for the falsehood that it is.

I am convinced that abortion is the most important issue of the 20th century. Whether a civilized society treats human life with dignity or contempt will determine the outcome of that civilization. Supporters for legalization of abortion in the 1960's never dreamed it would come to the debate that we face today over this grotesque procedure, the partial birth abortion.

In determining whether or not this country endorses this procedure, we make a moral statement of the utmost importance regarding the value of human life.

The legislative approach for abortion is of lesser consequence than the issue itself. Abortion regulation, like all acts of violence, traditionally and under the Constitution were dealt with locally until 1973 when the courts chose to legalize nationally the procedure. Removing the issue from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts so States could deal with all of the problems surrounding abortion would be more in line with the traditional constitutional approach to government. Obviously, all funding by any government ought to be prohibited in a society that pretends to protect human life and defend individual liberty.

It is now a worn-out cliché that abortion is defended in the name of women's rights and freedom of choice. But claiming to protect the freedom of one individual can never be an excuse to take the life of another. Life and liberty are never in conflict. Life and convenience may well be. The inconvenience and responsibility of caring for a hungry, crying baby at 3 a.m. never justifies baby killing, nor is an inconvenient baby in the womb a justification for its elimination.

For those who cry out for choice, let me point out that someone must speak out for the small, the weak, and the disenfranchised so their choice for life is heard.

No one in this body can challenge me on my defense of personal choice in all social, personal, and economic matters, but I do not accept the notion that choice means the right to take the life of a human being. That is a mockery of the English language and truth.

Those so bold who today would argue that choice means not only the killing of the unborn but the partially born as well, I say to you, where are you when it comes to real choice in economic transactions, hiring practices, gun ownership, use of private property, confiscatory taxing policy, taking personal risks, picking schools for our children, medications and medical procedures not yet approved by the FDA? Let me hear no more about choice as the excuse to kill. Please, with due respect, pick another less offensive word.

This great debate over life has lasted now for over 30 years, and it took the partial birth abortion procedure to crystallize vividly exactly what this debate is all about. The deliberate killing of a half-born infant, with heart beating, arms and legs flailing, and a

chest struggling for a first breath by aspirating the infant's brain is, to many of us, an uncivilized, abhorrent and unacceptable procedure.

Yet, we as a nation, now without a moral bearing, appear frozen as to what to do. The debate has boiled down to this: Should the police be called, or should the abortionist be paid a handsome fee?

For now, the best we can do is make a statement that there is a limit, and we have reached it. Hopefully some day there will be enough respect for local governments to handle problems like this, but we must forcefully acknowledge that the defense of all liberty requires the respect for all life.

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

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

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

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

DISCRIMINATION: TWO WRONGS DO NOT MAKE A RIGHT

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, the debate over affirmative action is not about whether discrimination exists in America today, because we all know that it does. The debate is over whether granting preferences based on race or gender is the way to eliminate that discrimination.

Webster's defines discrimination as, "a difference in treatment or a favor on a basis other than individual merit." Is that not what current affirmative action programs are all about, making decisions based primarily on gender and race?

The central tenet of all affirmative action programs is to give preferential treatment to someone not based on individual merit.

□ 1830

Individual merit ranks second to considerations of race or gender. It is clear that today's affirmative action programs fit under the definition of the word "discrimination." That brings us to the crux of this argument: Does it make sense to fight discrimination with discrimination, or do two wrongs make a right?

The answer to both, in my opinion, is no. Our country was built on the ideal of equal opportunity for all, and the original intent of affirmative action programs was to help provide a level

playing field for those who were not getting that opportunity. Unfortunately, once the Government got hold of it, that program which started out with the best intentions became a hire-by-the-numbers system involving quotas, set-asides, preferences, numerical goals, and timetables. What has been left out of the equation is the notion of individual merit, the important question of, Is this the best person for this job?

Today's affirmative action programs harm our society, both by lowering standards and by leaving the beneficiaries of the program to doubt their own ability. As a woman, I know beyond a shadow of a doubt that women can compete with any man on an equal playing field. I find the assumption that we need preferential treatment in order to succeed insulting.

Have women had a harder time advancing up the corporate ladder and getting access to educational opportunities? There is no doubt about that. But is affirmative action the way to create more opportunities for women, a quota here, a set-aside there, or should we be focusing on removing the barriers that keep women from advancing and succeeding on their own?

The Glass Ceiling Commission, started by former Labor Secretary Elizabeth Dole, takes a second approach. It has been tremendously effective. The Commission identified the barriers in the workplace that keep qualified women from moving up the corporate ladder. It then set about working with companies to find ways to remove those barriers, allowing women to advance on their own merit and qualifications.

Much of this process involves changing long-held beliefs, attitudes, and prejudices. Elizabeth Dole created the Glass Ceiling Commission from her firsthand knowledge of the kinds of barriers, both institutional and personal, that women face in both academia and the workplace. She was 1 of only 24 women in her Harvard law school class of 550, and I have heard her many times recount the disturbing yet not surprising comment made by one of her male classmates to her on her first day of class back in 1962. He said, "Elizabeth, what are you doing here? Don't you realize there are men who would give their right arm to be in this law school, men who would use their legal education?"

Not only was this man's attitude toward women at Harvard law school wrong, but he was certainly wrong about Elizabeth Dole using her legal education. Affirmative action programs treat the symptoms. What we should be treating is the illness itself. The problem with just treating the symptoms of discrimination with further discrimination in the form of affirmative action is that you make the underlying illness worse. You intensify feelings of resentment and prejudice among the very people from which we need to eradicate it.

If women and minorities are to be treated equally, and with respect, too, it is time to stop dividing our country along race and gender lines. Let us get back to traditional forms of affirmative action involving nondiscriminatory outreach, recruitment, and marketing efforts, and empower all Americans by providing equal opportunity in an atmosphere of strong economic growth.

AMERICA'S FUTURE LIES SECURELY IN THE HANDS OF OUR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about what came out of Hershey, PA. Of course, the tone of civility and discussion about civility was probably the predominant theme. However, there were matters of substance.

In fact, David McCullough, an award-winning author, provided some pretty inspiring comments for those of us who chose to attend. Mr. McCullough invited us, really, to take stock of history so we could get a perspective of where we want to go as a Congress and what agendas we wish to promote. Mr. McCullough pointed out that, of course, back in the 1860's when Abraham Lincoln was sworn in as President, as our 16th President of this country, the national agenda was focused around the civil strife that our country was enduring.

Moving ahead in history through the Great Depression, the national ambition was, of course, to pull ourselves out of the Depression, as well as with World War II and eventually the cold war with the growing Soviet menace. All those things had outside forces essentially dictating what the national policy was to be.

Mr. Speaker, now that the cold war is over, I think outside forces no longer are dictating our national agenda. I think we stand on the verge of a historic opportunity. I believe it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we create a new vision for this country. The newly elected Members of the Republican class of the 105th Congress have been speaking out in a positive way about the new vision that we hope to foster in the coming months and years ahead.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, Members may recall we focused as a class on community renewal. We touted real life success stories from individual districts that showcased creative ways that faith-based charities and private industries and communities were reaching out to the poor and needy, and ways to help the poor and needy, and ways Government could be a partner, rather than a parent.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, our class has decided to focus on the family, and

ways that this institution can help promote a family friendly agenda. We believe that strong families can make for a better America. In that fashion, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the newest member of our class who joined us after a special election in December. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, at the start of a school year, a teacher noticed that one of her students was particularly well behaved. Her manner was, in fact, exemplary. As the weeks went on she noticed even more because it stood out so much in her class. At one point she finally approached the young child and asked, Who taught you to be so polite and so kind-hearted? And the little girl laughed and said, really, no one. It runs in our family.

Enduring traits that built America run in America's families: That of individual responsibility, of caring for your neighbors, of contributing to the community in which you live and grow up and work, being involved in your church, in your Boy Scout troop, helping to build the community in which you live. America's future lies very securely in the hands of our families.

This year in the 105th Congress, the Republican leadership and the Republican Congress will take significant steps to make a real difference in our lives and in our families' lives. We will continue to bring the budget into balance, to rein in the IRS, and to lower interest rates. We must, because today most of us pay more in taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined. A balanced budget means lower rates on our mortgages, our student loans, and our car loans, and annual savings of about \$857 for a typical American family.

It is also time, and we are going to work hard, to restore safety to our streets and neighborhoods by waging a real war on drugs and violent crime. We want parents to be able to spend more time with their children, so today we have passed a family friendly workplace policy that Members are going to hear more about tonight. We will work to ensure our children inherit a clean, healthy environment, and receive the quality education they need to survive and succeed in this increasingly competitive world.

We face a lot of challenges, but America is blessed with hardworking, sturdy families. I believe so strongly in families because my family believes so strongly in me. My dad was killed when I was young, and my mom raised five of us by herself. She taught us by her example to take responsibility for ourselves, to practice our faith each day, and to give back to the community in which we live.

In our family my mom is a true American hero. If you look around your family and around your dinner table, and around the gatherings during the holiday, and listening on the