

"D & X" (Dilatation and Extraction), while Dr. McMahon of California refers to it as an "intact D & E." An ACOG ad hoc committee came up with the hybrid term "intact D & X". As you can see, many terms are used and are not clear in their description.

Partial birth abortion is mostly performed in the fifth and six months of pregnancy. However, these procedures have been performed up to the ninth month of pregnancy. The majority of patients undergoing this procedure do not have significant medical problems. In Dr. McMahon's series, less than ten percent were performed for maternal indications, and these included some ill-defined reasons such as depression, hyperemesis, drug exposed spouse, and youth. Many of the patients undergoing partial birth abortion are not even carrying babies with abnormalities. In Dr. McMahon's series, only about half of the babies were considered "flawed", and these included some easily correctable conditions like cleft lip and ventricular septal defect. Dr. Haskell claimed that eighty percent of his procedures were purely elective, and a group of New Jersey physicians claimed that only a minuscule amount of their procedures were done for genetic abnormalities or other defects. Most were performed on women of lower age, education, or socioeconomic status who either delayed or discovered late their unwanted pregnancies. It is also clear that this procedure occurs thousands of times a year, rather than a few hundred times a year, as claimed by pro-abortion advocates. This has been independently confirmed by the investigative work of The Washington Post, The New Jersey Bergen Record and the American Medical Association News.

One of the often ignored aspects of this procedure is that it requires three days to accomplish. Before performing the actual delivery, there is a two day period of cervical dilation that involves forcing up to twenty five dilators into the cervix at one time. This can cause great cramping and nausea for the women, who are then sent to their home or to a hotel room overnight while their cervix dilates. After returning to the clinic, their bag of water is broken, the baby is forced into a feet first position by grasping the legs and pulling it down through the cervix and into the vagina. This form of internal rotation, or version, is a technique largely abandoned in modern obstetrics because of the unacceptable risk associated with it. These techniques place the women at greater risk for both immediate (bleeding) and delayed (infection) complications. In fact, there may also be longer repercussions of cervical manipulation leading to an inherent weakness of the cervix and the inability to carry pregnancies to term. We have already seen women who have had trouble maintaining pregnancies after undergoing a partial birth abortion.

There is no record of these procedures in any medical text, journals, or on-line medical service. There is no known quality assurance, credentialing, or other standard assessment usually associated with newly-described surgical techniques. Neither the CDC nor the Alan Guttmacher Institute have any data on partial birth abortion, and certainly no basis upon which to state the claim that it is a safer or even a preferred procedure.

The bigger question then remains: Why ever do a partial birth abortion? There are and always have been safer techniques for partial birth abortion since it was first described by Dr. McMahon in 1989 and Dr. Haskell in 1992. The usual and customary (and previously studied) method of delivery at this gestation is the medical induction of labor using either intravaginal or intramuscular medications to cause contrac-

tions and expulsion of the baby. This takes about twelve hours on average, and may also include possible cervical preparation with the use of one to three cervical dilators (as opposed to the three-day partial birth abortion procedure, with up to 25 dilators in the cervix at one time). This also results in an intact baby for pathologic evaluation, without involving the other risk of internally turning the baby or forcing a large number of dilators into the cervix. The only possible "advantage" of partial birth abortion, if you can call it that, is that it guarantees a dead baby at time of delivery.

The less common situation of partial birth abortion involves, an abnormal baby. These conditions do not threaten a woman over and above a normal pregnancy, and do not require the killing of the baby to preserve her health or future fertility. I have taken care of many such women with the same diagnoses as the women who provided testimony on this issue in the past. Each of these women stated that they needed to have a partial birth abortion performed in order to protect their health or future fertility. In these cases of trisomy (extra chromosomal material), hydrocephaly (water on the brain), polyhydramnios (too much amniotic fluid) and arthrogryposis (stiffened baby), there are alternatives to partial birth abortion that do not threaten a woman's ability to bear children in the future. I have personally cared for many cases of all of these disorders, and have never required any technique like partial birth abortion in order to accomplish delivery. Additionally, I have never had a colleague that I have known to have used the technique of partial birth abortion in order to accomplish delivery in this same group of patients. Moreover, there are high profile providers of third trimester abortions who likewise do not use the technique of partial birth abortion.

In the even rarer case of a severe maternal medical condition requiring early delivery, partial birth abortion is not preferred, and medical induction suffices without threatening future fertility. Again, the killing of the fetus is not required, only separation from the mother.

Finally, I wish to address the fetal pain issue, since it has been claimed that a fetus feels no pain at these gestational ages. This is about as ridiculous as the earlier claim that the anesthesia of partial birth abortion put the baby into a medical coma and killed it prior to the performance of the auctioning technique. This was no small claim to the many pregnant women undergoing non-obstetric surgery every day in this country. Fortunately, this was soundly denounced by both the American Society of Anesthesiologists and the Society of Obstetrical Anesthesia and Perinatology. In the course of my practice, we must occasionally perform life-saving procedures on babies while still in the uterus. I have often observed babies of five to six months gestation withdraw from needles and instruments, much like a pain response. Dr. Fisk in England has recently reported an increase in fetal pain response hormones during the course of these procedures at these same gestational ages. In addition, we frequently observe the standard grimaces and withdrawals of neonates born at six months gestation like any other pain response in a more mature infant.

While it is not my desire for legislators to enter into the realm of medical policy making, there are times when the public health risk needs to be addressed if the medical community is either unwilling or unable to address it. We have seen this precedent for female circumcision and forty-eight hour postpartum stays. I believe the unnecessary, unstudied, and potentially dangerous procedure of partial birth abortion is unworthy of

continuance in modern obstetrics. It neither protects the life, the health or the future fertility of women, and certainly does not benefit the baby. For these reasons, I urge you to support the ban on partial birth abortion.

I thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony and my concern for the women and children of this country. •

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND REID

• Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great patriot who has served over 54 years in the Federal Government. On May 15, 1997, Raymond "Ray" T. Reid, retired from the U.S. House of Representatives, where he worked as a chief of staff for 23 years, lending his expertise and leadership to three different Congressmen representing the Third District of Arkansas. I was one of those fortunate Members who had the privilege of working with Ray for the 4 years that I served in the House. When I was first elected to Congress in 1992, I replaced John Paul Hammerschmidt, a retiring Member who had represented the Third District for 26 years, and had become a legend both on Capitol Hill and in the State of Arkansas. However, it was no secret that behind this great politician was Ray Reid, a man who over the years had become an Arkansas legend himself. When John Paul retired, his work continued on through Ray's service and dedication. As a newly elected freshman, Ray provided my office with continuity, efficiency, stability, and a wisdom that could only come from 19 years of being a chief of staff.

The successful career of Ray Reid began long before he worked on Capitol Hill. Ray began his career back in 1942 when he left Bowdoin College in Brunswick, ME, to join the U.S. Army to defend our Nation in World War II. Following the war, he rose quickly up the ranks, receiving honors for his leadership ability and outstanding achievement. He made the Army his career for 31 years, where he served on both foreign soil and here in the United States. Ray moved his family several times, living in countries around the globe. He fought for freedom and justice in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam in addition to faithfully serving his country in peacetime.

He continued his service undiminished until December 31, 1973, when he retired from the Army as a colonel. Having worked in the Office of the Congressional Liaison at the Pentagon, Ray was able to make a smooth, natural transition to working in a congressional office. He brought to Congressman Hammerschmidt's office a vast degree of knowledge from several years of international exposure and a solid background in domestic policy. By the time Ray came to work for me, he was an invaluable resource who possessed a wealth of information and experience. Throughout his tenure as chief of staff in my office, he provided guidance and an institutional knowl-

edge which would have been difficult to match. I can say without hesitation that Ray Reid conducted legislative business with the highest ethical standards. The best interests of the residents of the Third District were always placed above partisan politics and our office was managed in a way that was beyond reproach. When I moved over to the Senate, Ray demonstrated his commitment to the constituents of the Third District once again by agreeing to see another freshman, my brother, ASA, through the transition process.

So, today, as Ray enjoys the first Monday that he doesn't need to go to work after over a half a century of public service, on behalf of the State of Arkansas and the people he touched here on Capitol Hill, I want to offer my deepest thanks to a man whose loyalty and friendship will not be forgotten. Truly a job well done.●

TRIBUTE TO HOLLIS/BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS MATH TEAM

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Hollis/Brookline High School math team members who recently took first place in the small school division at the New Hampshire State Mathematics Contest.

As a former teacher myself, I commend their teamwork and talent which helped the 14-member squad oust 48 other teams for the State title and top the 19-team NH-SMASH league.

Math team adviser Vina Duffy also deserves special recognition for giving the team an organized and supporting approach to math. She encouraged the students' interest and animated the diverse group to strengthen their aptitude. The team had no formal practice, and had only worksheets to prepare them for the meets. Their congeniality and confidence grew with the number of wins they achieved.

I would like to honor math team members: Karl Athony, Dave Clark, Tyler Dumont, Michel Franklin, Mary Fries, Jason Glastetter, Jason Kerouac, Eric Larose, Bert Lue, James Robson, Jared Rosenberg, Steve Watkins, and Matt White.

Mr. President, I want to congratulate these outstanding young minds for their excellent performance and team-spirit and I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.●

DECEPTIVE BUDGET DEAL

● Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I suggest that before we begin thinking about patting ourselves on the back for the budget agreement that was finalized last week, we consider the hard work ahead. The agreement is merely a broad outline—a blueprint—for the spending and tax bills yet to come. We still need to consider how it is supposed to be implemented before claiming any sort of victory.

We need to consider, for example, whether it will actually lead to a bal-

anced budget by the year 2002. Is it good for families? Will it ensure that the Medicare Program is protected for today's generation of retirees and for our children and grandchildren? Will it help the economy produce the jobs needed for those trying to get off welfare, or those entering the work force for the first time? Will it help more young people get a college education? Will it provide the resources needed to safeguard our country from immediate and future threats from abroad?

Mr. President, as the broad outline of the budget agreement with the White House has been filtering out over the last 2 weeks, I could not help but think of the budget deal that was brokered by President Bush and congressional Democrats 7 years ago.

Here is what President Bush said when he announced that agreement in a broadcast on October 2, 1990:

It is the biggest deficit-reduction agreement ever; half a trillion dollars. It's the toughest deficit-reduction package ever, with new enforcement rules to make sure that what we fix now stays fixed. And it has the largest spending savings ever, more than \$300 billion.

Of course, the agreement produced no such thing. Looking back, it produced bigger deficits, not smaller deficits—221 billion dollars' worth of red ink in 1990, rising to \$290 billion in 1993. Federal spending increased from \$1.2 to \$1.4 trillion—up nearly 17 percent in just 3 years. So the mere fact that there is an agreement with the President is not reason enough to believe that the problem has been solved. As Gen. George S. Patton once said, "if everybody is thinking alike, then somebody isn't thinking." We need to look objectively at the details, and whether the plan is reflective of values that our constituents sent us here to uphold.

Right now, people are not sure. A CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll released on May 8 indicated that an overwhelming majority of Americans—roughly 8 in 10—do not believe the deal will actually result in a balanced budget by 2002. Obviously, we need to take a careful look at what is being proposed here before deciding whether or not to support it.

Mr. President, let me quote some of the words President Clinton used on May 2 when he announced the latest budget agreement. I think they will show why people have reason to be skeptical. While suggesting that "it will be the first balanced budget in three decades," the President went on to note that it would "continue to increase our investments," "expand coverage," "restore cuts," "extend new benefits," and "increase" spending, while "moderating excessive cuts." My friends, we cannot balance the budget by increasing spending and funding a whole host of new programs and benefits. Let us be honest about that. If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is.

As I recall, the goal in 1990, as it was again in 1997, was to devise a plan to

balance the budget, while providing long-term Federal spending constraints and incentives for economic growth. I opposed the 1990 agreement, believing it was seriously flawed on all those counts, and I see similar problems looming in the latest agreement.

Let me focus first on the issue of taxes. The deal with the Clinton White House is different from the 1990 plan in that it includes some very modest tax cuts. But because the amount of tax reductions President Clinton would agree to is so small—less than 2 percent of the revenue that the Federal Government expects to raise over the next 5 years—it remains to be seen whether there is any tax relief here worthy of the name.

I know that some might ask why we even need a tax cut when the economy continues to grow at a relatively healthy clip. There are two reasons. First, think of families. A \$500-per-child tax credit can make a world of difference to a mom and dad sitting around the kitchen table trying to find a way to pay for their daughter's education, to pay for summer camp or braces for the kids. What single mom could not use a \$500-per-child credit to help make ends meet?

Yes, the Federal Government could keep the money and try to provide some kind of aid to these families. But if families could keep more of their hard-earned money to do for themselves, we probably would not need government to do so many things. It seems to me that we ought to put our trust in families to do what is right by their own children. And unfortunately, it is not clear we can accommodate the full \$500-per-child credit under this plan.

What about tax relief for small businesses, including the new businesses started by women and minorities? After all, that is where most of the new jobs around the country are created. Provide a meaningful tax cut, and small businesses and family farms could expand, hire new people, pay better wages, and do the things necessary to become more competitive.

Alternatively, Government can keep the taxes. But remember, it then turns around and provides a whole host of subsidies to businesses because they do not have the resources to do for themselves.

It is an endless cycle. When people are not left with enough to care for themselves, the Government tries to do more. When it does more, it taxes more, and people are left with even less. It has to stop somewhere. Americans need some relief.

Mr. President, it is also important to understand how important a healthy and growing economy is to balancing the budget. We just received word from the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] that this year's deficit is expected to decline to \$70 billion. That is \$55 billion less than President Clinton's budget assumed as recently as February. And it is largely the result of two things: