

rate educational institution without Mr. Fowler, the college will indeed lose a remarkable educator.

Mr. Speaker, even though Mr. Fowler is set to retire, I know that he will be an active participant in the community for years to come. Again, thank you, Mr. Fowler, for your many years of service.

BABIES AS MEDICAL PRODUCTS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, John Kass, a thoughtful columnist for the Chicago Tribune, on June 28, 1999, wrote an important column about a development in modern medicine that has the most serious consequences for the value of human life. I commend Mr. Kass' article to my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 28, 1999]

DRAW THE LINE NOW AGAINST USING BABIES AS MEDICAL PRODUCTS

(By John Kass)

It's an ugly twist on an old science fiction theme:

Would you use the body parts of an innocent baby so that you could live a happier life?

Would you support a system of incentives to kill other babies, and process them like meat at a packing plant, for the benefit of a frightened Baby Boom generation terrified of Alzheimer's disease and death?

Of course not. The suggestion is monstrous and dehumanizing. By comparison, it makes what the Serbs and Albanians are doing to each other look like a gentle game.

But the science fiction scenario doesn't generate the terrifying passions of old Balkan blood feuds.

Instead, it's calculated, without anger, and practiced by reasonable men and women in white lab coats.

It's about pure reason, efficiency and scientific rationalism. It's what a culture can do when it loses its soul. If you don't believe me, ask a Jew about the Nazi concentration camps.

So get horrified. Because it's not science fiction. It's happening now, in our country.

I read about it in Sunday's Tribune, in a fascinating story by science writer Ronald Kotulak under the headline "Stem cells opening path to brain repair."

It began with an anecdote about a woman with Parkinson's disease. Her name is Dr. Jacqueline Winterkorn. The drugs she was taking to fight the disease weren't working anymore.

"It's a very sad disease," Dr. Winterkorn was quoted as saying. "People are locked into bodies that don't move. Their brains are working, their minds are working, but they can't talk and they can't move."

In other words, they're human beings immobilized through no fault of their own, trapped without speech. They have emotions, but they can't do anything about it. They're helpless.

Like a fetus.

But Dr. Winterkorn's condition began improving, the story said, after she was given millions of new brain stem cells because her own brain cells weren't doing their jobs. Her brain cells weren't producing enough dopamine to control her movements.

The new brain stem cells worked just fine. They produced dopamine in her brain. She improved. The scientists are thrilled.

"The prospect of repairing a damaged brain is pretty remarkable," said Dr. Curt Freed, who did the study. "It has been possible to show significant improvements in some patients who suffered from a chronic neurologic disease for an average of 14 years."

But there is a price for Dr. Freed's success. The new brain cells have to come from somewhere. And they don't come from pigs.

They come from fetuses, which is a polite way of saying they come from tiny human beings. The tiny human beings didn't willingly give up their brains. Nobody asked them to sign papers donating their bodies to science.

They didn't have much say in the matter. They were aborted.

The National Institutes of Health—which means the federal government—has lifted its ban on the use of human fetal cells and is bankrolling several other similar studies.

Meanwhile, the White House worries that video games cheapen human life and make possible massacres like the one in Littleton, Colo.

Courts and abortion rights advocates have said that what grows in a mother's womb is not a human being. You don't say baby. That's impolite. You say "it," because that makes a human being easier to kill.

The debate over abortion is an old one now. Most folks have settled into their positions and defend them vigorously. That's not going to change.

What's changing is that we're progressing to a civilized new stage—turning human beings into valuable commodities—in which the bodies of the helpless are used to improve the lives of the powerful.

And it's being done in the name of cold scientific reason. The rhetorical pathway was cleared years ago, when the Germans built Buchenwald and Auschwitz and other places.

Soon other folks with Parkinson's or other brain disorders such as Alzheimer's disease will seek such treatments. The Baby Boom generation that has never been denied will make its demands.

It's human nature to use available resources to satisfy the most powerful human need: staying alive.

So aborted human babies will become resources. They'll become products, subjected to the market. Because they'll have value, there will be an incentive to provide more. Their bodies will be served up for the benefit of adults.

If we don't stop it now, if we accept this crime in the name of scientific reason, we'll lose ourselves.

Ask a mother carrying a child inside her. Ask her if it's not human. Ask any father who puts his hand on his expectant wife's belly and feels a tiny foot.

In a few weeks, they're out and looking up to you. They grab your finger. You kiss their necks. Someday, when they're old enough, they might ask you what fetal brain stem cell research is all about.

What will you tell them?

THERE THEY GO AGAIN: MORE ON THE CLINTON-GORE SCHEME TO BLACKLIST U.S. JOBS

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the perspective of the Investor's Business Daily newspaper on the Clinton-Gore scheme to blacklist certain

U.S. employers, threaten the jobs of U.S. workers, and increase taxpayers' cost of the government buying goods and services.

DOES RULE "BLACKLIST" BUSINESS?

CONTRACTORS MAY BE PRESUMED GUILTY UNDER GORE PLAN

(By John Berlau)

Al Gore's official campaign for president has just begun. But he's already upholding a pledge to organized labor that has business groups fuming.

Gore made his promise when House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, D-MO—a union favorite—was considering a White House run. In February 1997, Gore told the AFL-CIO Executive Council that "the Clinton administration will seek to bar companies with poor labor records from receiving government contracts."

If a company wants to do business with the Federal Government, Gore said, it has to "respect civil, human and union rights."

Fearing that this promise could become a regulation that favors organized labor, groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Associated General Contractors of America have been worrying ever since.

Their fears may be justified. The rule is now circulating around federal agencies and lawmakers' offices. It's expected to be published in July.

It would give bureaucrats power to deny government contracts to companies that are merely accused of violating labor, antitrust, health, consumer or environmental laws. The charges don't have to be proved in court; allegations alone may be enough.

The rule could affect the \$180 billion spent on federal contracts with private companies each year. It's estimated that companies doing at least some business with the Federal Government employ more than 25 million people and account for more than a fifth of the work force.

The rule is "much, much worse" than expected, said labor lawyer Hal Coxson, who's executive director of the National Alliance Against Blacklisting, a coalition of business groups opposed to the rule.

"This is huge," said Randy Johnson, vice president for labor and employee benefits at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

But Steven Kelman, head of the White House Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) from 1993 to 1997, said the rule represents "a common sense point of view: If you violate the law, you can't do business with the Federal Government." Kelman says it's not that different from existing rules contractors must obey.

Gore spokesman Christopher Lehane told National Journal that the vice president "has paid a great deal of attention to (the proposal) because it will help labor in its efforts to continue organizing."

Attempts to get comments from Gore's campaign, his office and OFPP were unsuccessful.

A copy of the regulation obtained by Investor's Business Daily shows how far it could reach.

It says bureaucrats should deny a government contract if there's "persuasive evidence of the prospective contractor's lack of compliance with tax laws, or substantial noncompliance with labor and employment laws, environmental laws, antitrust laws and other consumer protections."

In some cases, violations don't have to be proved. According to the rule, "final adjudication" isn't needed if the contracting officer finds "persuasive evidence of substantial noncompliance with a law or regulation."

A fact sheet White House officials provided to lawmakers gives specific examples of

when contracts could be denied. These include complaints filed by:

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission involving "alleged employment discrimination."

The National Labor Relations Board for "an alleged unfair labor practice."

The Labor Department "in a matter involving alleged violations of OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration)" rules.

Because the government could deny contracts based on suspicion and allegations, rather than proven charges, critics call this the "blacklisting regulation."

This could drive a wedge between Gore and one industry he claims to champion—the high-tech sector.

Nancy Saucier, manager of domestic policy for the [American Electronics Association], high tech's biggest trade group, said fighting this regulation is one of the [AEA]'s "top three" issues this year.

The Defense Department "is the largest purchaser in the world of high-tech products," Saucier said. "If (companies suddenly) found that they're winning only 50% of the contracts that they won before, due to these arbitrary determinations, it's going to affect their bottom lines incredibly." The rule will probably affect companies' share prices as well, she adds.

Saucier and others worry the rule will give perverse incentives for companies to dig up dirt on their rivals. Coxson notes that consumer and environmental groups and disgruntled employees could also present complaints to agencies in order to deny companies contracts.

Former OFPP head Kelman, now a professor of public management at Harvard, said he thinks the power to bar companies for suspected violations will only be used in "extremely egregious" cases.

He confidently predicted that "a contracting officer, given his lack of expertise, is going to be extremely reluctant to make a determination that's not based on a final adjudication." He also notes that companies can sue if they feel they've been wrongly denied a contract.

Attorney Karen Hastie Williams, head of OFPP under President Carter, strongly disagrees. The rule "can be the camel's nose under the tent in terms of coming up with arbitrary criteria to be used (against contractors)," she said.

A company unfairly denied a contract would have to go through costly lawsuits and still couldn't win back its bid, Williams says. These delays would end up costing companies and taxpayers.

Williams, who now represents companies that have contracts with the government, says contracting officers already have the power to review a company's legal history if it's relevant to the contract.

But this rule would open the door to punishing technical violations of complex rules, Williams says. In labor law, companies are often found guilty when they haven't followed procedures correctly. "Often there hasn't been any harm to anybody," she said.

The White House and Kelman call this rule a clarification of existing law. Williams and Coxson believe it does much more. They say the rule substantially amends procurement law and other statutes by adding a new penalty—denying contracts.

Coxson notes that in the 1970s and 1980s, lawmakers couldn't get provisions banning contracts for labor law violations through a Democratic Congress.

Prospects for getting this through a Republican Congress are even less likely. Rep. Charlie Norwood, R-Ga., who heads a subcommittee of the House Education and Workforce Committee, strongly opposes the rule.

An aide says Norwood may try to get lawmakers to overturn the rule.

Coxson says it may be unconstitutional, because Congress hasn't delegated this power to the White House. He and other lawyers also say it could violate the Constitution's "due process" provisions.

Business groups also worry about a part of the rule saying that contractors must have the "necessary workplace practices" addressing "worker retention." They say this could bar contracts to companies that lay off workers or hire striker replacements.

"Gore promised this," the Chamber's Johnson said. "He can tell organized labor he went forward, and then, if it dies, he can blame the Republicans."

TRIBUTE TO FORMER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR BOB BULLOCK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Former Lieutenant Governor Bob Bullock. The man I speak of today is so deeply entrenched in the political framework of Texas, that he has often been regarded as a legend in my home state.

Bob passed away on June 18th 1999, and the entire State of Texas mourns his death. But I stand before you today to salute his life. I am proud to say that Bob Bullock was a friend of mine, in both the personal and political arena. This man was renowned for having an explosive temper and striking fear into his opponents. Yes, he did have an iron fist, but a heart of gold as well. Mr. Bullock will be remembered as a man whose dedication to the state of Texas stood above all political agendas.

Bob Bullock began his career as a public servant in 1956, winning a seat in the Texas Legislature. I had the opportunity to serve with Bob when I began my service in the Texas House of Representatives in 1972, and the foresight to endorse him as a candidate for statewide Comptroller in 1974. Mr. Bullock held the office of Comptroller for 16 years, before being elected to the office of Lieutenant Governor in 1990.

He served the State of Texas as Lieutenant Governor until he chose not to seek re-election in 1998. As Comptroller and Lieutenant Governor, Bob Bullock influenced so much of the major legislation passed in Texas over the past two decades, that he has been considered a political giant. In fact, Governor George W. Bush paid tribute to Bob Bullock by calling him "the largest Texan of our time." Bob Bullock has reached legendary status because his political savvy allowed him to have a hand in nearly every major piece of legislation in Texas since the 1970's. Among Mr. Bullock's greatest accomplishments as Comptroller and Lieutenant Governor, were public education reform, water conservation, and performance reviews of state programs.

Bob Bullock has had to overcome nearly as many struggles in his personal life as in his professional life. Mr. Bullock had been plagued by health problems, fighting as vigorously against illness as he had against political opposition.

He won battles against depression, and alcoholism. He survived a heart attack and heart

bypass surgery. Bob was an inspiration to all, sustaining his vibrance in the political realm though in less than the best of health. Unfortunately, Bob Bullock's health problems eventually caught up with him. In his final days Bob lost the battle to lung cancer and heart disease.

Loved by some, but respected by all. He was one of the greatest legislators in the history of the State of Texas. The Lone Star will be forever indebted to this man or his vision, and his determination as a lawmaker. A longtime top aide of the former Lieutenant Governor affirmed that "he never forgets anything" and Texas will never forget Bob Bullock.

A GREAT MAN WHO CONTINUES TO OFFER EACH OF US INSIGHT FOR THE FUTURE

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to notify the House of Representatives of a speech recently given by the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich. In May, with the other Republican women Members of Congress I invited women from around the country to attend the second annual Republican Women Leaders Forum.

At the forum there were many speeches given, but one of the highlights was a speech given by Newt Gingrich on the morning of May 12, 1999. His speech was heard by over 1,000 women and received ten standing ovations. The speech moved me and many of my colleagues who were in attendance.

As the man who led us in capturing and holding a Republican majority in Congress for the first time since 1928, his comments continue to offer each of us insight for the future.

SPEECH OF NEWT GINGRICH, REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP FORUM, RONALD REAGAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTER, WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 12, 1999

Thank you very, very much, and thank you Sue, [Myrick] and thank you Jennifer [Dunn] for inviting me and I also want to mention Mac Collins a colleague from Georgia who came by a few minutes ago. It was great to see him. This is actually the first serious policy speech I've made since stepping down as Speaker.

And I want to say, first of all, how grateful I am to be here. I had many offers, obviously, but what Jennifer Dunn has done in bringing together women leaders from all over the country is so important, and when she called me a couple of months ago, I said this was a date I would circle and be here.

And I'm honored to be here with all of you. And remember, those of you who were here last year, I revealed that—just as many of you are soccer moms. I was a ballet dad. [laughter] And so I think our concern for children our concern for how they grow up, we share a lot of that.

I also couldn't help but think as Sue was talking about the fact that the first two women to be officers of the House were under the Republicans. The Democrats had never had a woman as officer of the House. The first women to chair full committees were Republicans; the first time we had three women in the leadership was under the Republicans.