

help us guard what we watch on TV, movies and videos. Our O'Connell survey shows 89 percent of CTO kids watch scary movies and 75 percent of O'Connell parents know they watch scary movies. We think these results are scary! Yours Truly, Mrs. Brooks' 4th Grade Class. P.S. Could you please guide us and pay attention to what we are watching?"

These children and so many more throughout America are crying out for help. They want guidance. They want to be told what is right and what is wrong. We parents have an obligation to give our children this guidance. We need to do a better job of watching what our children watch, talking to them about what they are seeing, and providing them with positive alternatives to watching scary shows.

We need to follow the Ten Commandments as laid down by one of the grade schools in my district. These are their Ten Commandments: "Read, read read, read, read, read, read, read, read." They have those Ten Commandments posted throughout that school.

I will tell the Members, instead of fear, instead of the stuff of nightmares, those kids are going to sleep thinking about the story they have read with their parents, the conversations that it has spawned, the adventures life offers to us all, the world and the exploration of that world through which they gain so much in knowledge and spirit.

Yes, it is through reading together that we and our children can talk about bullying, about violence, about love, about opportunity, about freedom, and responsibility. Listen to these fourth grade kids of Mrs. Brooks' class. They are talking to all of us today.

TO BE A FEMINIST MEANS TO BE PRO-LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, at one time or another we have all seen the bumper sticker which reads: "Pro-Women = Pro-Choice," and it is presumed that feminists and defenders of equity and rights for women are defenders of abortion.

But in fact, what most feminists do not wish to acknowledge is that the early suffragists who are responsible for today's women's movement actually were staunchly pro-life.

Over a century ago, Susan B. Anthony tirelessly campaigned for suffrage for women's employment rights and for the abolition of slavery. She voted illegally, took part in the underground railroad, and yes, Susan B. Anthony, a mother of the feminist movement, opposed abortion.

In The Revolution, the radical women's paper which she published, along with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Anthony strongly editorialized against abortion.

She referred to the bloody act as child murder and infanticide, and addressed its root causes in women's oppression and in the abdication of family planning. She argued that laws pertaining to abortion victimized women while absolving men of all responsibility.

Susan B. Anthony was not alone in her thinking. Other early feminists also opposed abortion. For example, Elizabeth Cady Stanton proclaimed that "If it is degrading to treat a woman as property, it is no better for a woman to treat her own child as property." Suffragist Margaret Sanger stated that abortion was a disowning of feminine values.

The first female presidential candidate, Victoria Woodhull, was likewise strongly against abortion. She stated that every woman knows that if she were free, she would never bear an unwished-for child nor think of murdering one before its birth.

Astonishingly enough, most feminists prefer to ignore that Alice Paul, the original author of the Equal Rights Amendment, the ERA, of 1923, said: "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." Naturally, Paul opposed the later trend of linking abortion with the ERA movement.

Like the early suffragists who fought to give women's rights, a feminist should believe in the right to protect her own body, and in the likeness of Susan B. Anthony, the feminist, should stand up to defend the poor, oppressed, and rejected. She should fight for all human beings, whether they are black or white, born or unborn.

The phrase, "It's a man's world" is often used to describe today's society, a society which tends to view unplanned pregnancy and motherhood as an inconvenience. But many of today's feminists, rather than focusing on a woman's financial distress, the problems she may be facing at school, work, or at home, choose to give in to the pressures of a man's world.

Rather than fight for acceptance and protection for women facing unexpected pregnancies, many feminists suggest a dangerous, potentially fatal abortion as the remedy to all conditions. What would the suffragists have to say about giving in to this cruel society? Early feminist Susan Norton said, "Perhaps there will come a time when an unmarried mother will not be despised because of her motherhood, when the right of the unborn to be born will not be denied or interfered with."

As one of six pro-life women in Congress and a mother of two daughters, I believe that abortion is not a sign that women are free to choose. On the contrary, it is a sign that women incorrectly feel desperate and feel that they have no choice. Susan B. Anthony and the early defenders of the women's rights would agree that the slogan "pro-choice" is by no means to be equated with being pro-women. Perhaps if the early feminists were alive today, they would be fighting to amend those bumper stickers to instead read, "Pro-Women = Pro-Life."

I would like to thank the tireless pro-life advocate, Jane Abraham, president of the Susan B. Anthony List, for her inspiration. Jane has dedicated her time to enlighten persons on the feminist movement in America and to educate and train pro-life women for successful political careers.

Tonight I congratulate Jane and the many pro-life organizations and the countless volunteers who persevere in their hopes for finding a cure to our Nation's abortion rates.

INAUGURATION OF NEW SLOVAK PRESIDENT, THE HONORABLE RUDOLF SCHUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Members of Congress, I wish to extend sincere congratulations to the Honorable Rudy Schuster, who will be inaugurated as Slovakia's first popularly-elected president.

In just a few short hours, on June 15 in Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, a dynamic new leader will assume the presidency of one of Eastern Europe's most promising democracies. This is a significant step for the Slovak Republic, a country that only gained its independence in January of 1993.

For nearly 1,000 years the Slovak people have been dominated by others, so the popular election of Rudy Schuster and his inauguration is a special milestone in the history of this newly-emerging independent Nation.

It has been my great pleasure to personally know this man, who will assume the Slovak presidency. Rudy Schuster has been an outstanding mayor of Slovakia's second largest city, Kosice. In that city, Rudy Schuster has worked to spur economic and community development. He championed historic preservation and restoration. He provided minority housing and promoted privatization.

I have had the opportunity to see firsthand both the achievements of this dynamic leader and observe his ability to effectively govern. How fortunate the people of Slovakia and the West are to have such a capable and visionary individual helping to lead this new Nation at this time.

The people of Slovakia are to be commended for looking to the future with Rudy Schuster's election. Working with the new progressive parliamentary coalition, the potential for solving some of Slovakia's difficult challenges holds great promise.

As Mr. Schuster assumes the office of president, it is critical that he and his country's other leaders work together to address the problems of unemployment, privatization, and alignment with Western and European economic and security organizations.

It is essential that Slovakia, which borders five European nations, now

take its rightful place as a full participant in the European and Western marketplace. It is critical that in the future, Slovakia be admitted to NATO, as it now shares 87 percent of its borders with this Western security alliance. It is vital to American interests that this new democracy of 5 million people strategically located in the very heart of Europe succeeds as it makes the difficult transition from socialism to free enterprise.

With the popular election of Rudy Schuster as president, Slovakia has a golden opportunity to prosper and set an example for other former Soviet bloc countries. The Slovaks have survived domination by other people, monarchies, other countries, communism, and Hitler. These resilient people have waited a long time to elect their own president.

How pleased I am, as the grandson of a Slovak immigrant, to congratulate my friend and a great leader on the occasion of his inauguration, the Honorable Rudy Schuster, the first popularly elected president of the Slovak Republic. June 15 will be a great day for those who respect and promote democracy, for without intervention, without the pain and the agony that we have seen in other parts of the world recently, the people of Slovakia have demonstrated that even those who have been the most oppressed can never have the spirit of freedom and self-determination permanently separated from their souls.

PAUL HARVEY'S LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, later this week this House will take up the explosive issue of youth violence and guns.

I would like to read from a column by Paul Harvey. I quote:

For the life of me, I cannot understand what could have gone wrong in Littleton, Colorado. If only the parents had kept their children away from guns, we wouldn't have had such a tragedy.

Yeah, it must have been the guns. It couldn't have been because half of our children are being raised in broken homes. It couldn't have been because our children get to spend an average of 30 seconds in meaningful conversation with their parents each day. After all, we give our children quality time.

It couldn't have been because we treat our children as pets and our pets as children. It couldn't have been because we place our children in day care centers where they learn their socialization skills from their peers under the law of the jungle while employees who have no vested interest in the children look on and make certain that no blood is spilled.

It couldn't have been because we allow our children to watch, on aver-

age, 7 hours of television every day, filled with the glorification of sex and violence that is not fit for adult consumption. It couldn't have been because we allow our children to enter into virtual worlds in which, to win the game, one must kill as many opponents as possible in the most sadistic way possible.

It couldn't have been because we sterilized and contracepted our families down to sizes so small that the children that we do have are so spoiled with material things that they come to equate the receiving of material with love. It couldn't have been because our children, who historically have been seen as a blessing from God, are now being viewed as either a mistake created when contraception fails or inconveniences that parents try to raise in their spare time.

□ 1900

It could not have been because our Nation has become the world leader in developing a culture of death in which 20 to 30 million babies have been killed by abortion. It could not have been because we give 2-year prison sentences to children who kill their newborns. It could not have been because our school systems teach children that they are nothing but glorified apes who have evolutionized out of some primordial soup of mud by teaching them that evolution is a fact and by handing out condoms as if they were candy.

It could not have been because we teach our children that there are no laws of morality that transcend us; that everything is relative and that actions do not have consequences. What the heck. The President gets away with it. Nah, it must have been the guns, closed quote.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform is once again being painted as the solution to political corruption in Washington. Indeed, that is a problem, but today's reformers hardly offer a solution. The real problem is that government has too much influence over our economy and lives, creating tremendous incentive to protect one's own interest by investing in politicians.

The problem is not a lack of Federal laws or rules regulating campaign spending. Therefore, more laws will not help. We hardly suffer from too much freedom. Any effort to solve the campaign finance problem with more laws will only make things worse by further undermining the principles of liberty and private property ownership.

There is tremendous incentive for every special interest group to influence government. Every individual, bank or corporation that does business with government invests plenty in in-

fluencing government. Lobbyists spend over \$100 million per month trying to influence Congress. Taxpayers' dollars are endlessly spent by bureaucrats in their effort to convince Congress to protect their own empires. Government has tremendous influence over the economy and financial markets through interest rate controls, contracts, regulations, loans and grants. Corporations and others are forced to participate in the process out of greed, as well as self defense, since that is the way the system works.

Equalizing competition and balancing powers such as between labor and business is a common practice. As long as this system remains in place, the incentive to buy influence will continue.

The reformers argue only that the fault is those who are trying to influence government and not the fault of the members who yield to the pressure of the system that generates the abuse. This allows Members of Congress to avoid assuming responsibility for their own acts and instead places the blame on those who exert pressure on Congress through the political process, which is a basic right bestowed on all Americans.

The reformers' argument is to stop us before we capitulate and before we capitulate to the special interest groups. Politicians unable to accept this responsibility clamor for a system that diminishes the need for politicians to persuade individuals and groups to donate money to their campaigns. Instead of persuasion, they endorse coercing taxpayers to finance campaigns. This only changes the special interest groups that control government policy. Instead of voluntary groups making their own decisions with their own money, politicians and bureaucrats dictate how political campaigns will be financed and run.

Not only will politicians and bureaucrats gain influence over elections, other nondeservers will benefit. Clearly incumbents will greatly benefit by more controls over campaign spending, a benefit to which the reformers will never admit.

The quasi two-party system will become more entrenched by limiting the huge expenditures required to oust an incumbent. Alternative choices and third party candidates will be further handicapped if all the reforms proposed are passed. The media become a big winner. Their influence grows as the private money is regulated. It becomes more difficult to refute media propaganda, both print and electronic, when directed against a candidate if funds are limited. The wealthy gain a significant edge since it is clear candidates can spend unlimited personal funds in elections. This is a big boost for the independently wealthy candidates over the average challenger who needs to raise and spend large funds to compete.

Celebrities will gain an even greater benefit than they already enjoy. Celebrity status is money in the bank, and