

of eight countries, and the only current country and prospective trading partner, that was listed on all of the major tax haven watchdog lists. In fact, Panama has been a key target of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development for resisting international norms in combating tax evasion and money laundering.

And now to tie this all into one big bow, we've learned that AIG, arrogance, incompetence, greed, has sued the U.S. Government demanding more than \$306 million in taxes it paid, twice the amount of what it paid in the now infamous executive bonuses.

Here is what AIG is claiming. AIG is claiming it overpaid taxes related to the activities of its AIG-linked Panamanian corporation, Star International Company, which is chartered in the tax haven of Panama. And if President Bush's Panama Free Trade Agreement is ratified, AIG's largest shareholder, which is this derivative in Panama and other offshore companies, would have expansive new rights to challenge U.S. tax laws.

In fact, there are currently 350,000 foreign firms that are registered in Panama where there are zero to low regulations and taxing restrictions. So we know that, if this treaty is ratified, these policies will inhibit the ability to protect the American people, crack down on money laundering and tax cheating and shady financial deals.

So one of the things that we've learned is that there is linkage between the important concept of corporate accountability, fair trade policies, and I want to yield to my friend from New York to talk a little bit about how those issues combine and how they affect the people that he represents in upstate New York.

Mr. ARCURI. Well, first off, I would like to say thank you and commend my colleague from Virginia for his well-thought-out and very articulate presentation with respect to corporate accountability. We certainly can use that kind of passion here in Congress, and I thank you for that, what you said, and what you talked about.

You know, one of the things that I'd like to talk about just for a moment is something we haven't touched on yet tonight but is a very important part of the populist values, as articulated by you earlier, and that's with respect to consumer protection.

You and I took a trip down to the Port of Nogales last year to work with and get a firsthand view of some of the things we're seeing with respect to the border patrol. But one of the things we did see is the fact that the Port of Nogales is one of the largest ports for bringing fruits and vegetables into this country, many of which are from Mexico. And one of the things that I think is very important is that we need to ensure that the fruits, the vegetables, the food that we eat, the toys that our children play with are high quality. They need to be safe.

We put these strict standards on domestically produced food, on the kind

of fertilizers that our farmers can use, on the kind of pesticides they can use, to ensure that the food that they produce is safe. And yet, we have these free trade agreements and we have the ability of some other countries to bring products into our country that don't follow the same kind of protections and don't have the same kind of laws that we have here, which I think jeopardizes the quality of the food we get and certainly the products that we get.

So that's something that's so important to us, to the people that I represent back home and I think the people all through America.

So it's an important thing, and I know we're running out of time here, but I think it's something that we need to discuss more and we need to spend a great deal of time on here in Congress because there's nothing more important than keeping the food that we eat and the goods that our family uses as safe as possible.

Before I yield back, I would just like to say one last thing. You know, I want to quote another Roosevelt. I started off quoting Franklin Roosevelt. I want to finish by quoting Teddy Roosevelt, and he said, The welfare of each of us is dependent fundamentally upon the welfare of all of us. That sounds an awful lot like what President Obama is saying, that we're all in this together. We can't forget that whether you're a corporate executive or you're a worker on the line, what is good for the executive is good for the worker, and what is good for the worker is good for the executive.

We are all in this together, and as my colleague from Virginia said, it is important that we remember the things that we do affect each and every American, regardless of where you are or where you work.

So, with that, I would again like to thank my friend for organizing this today.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank you, and before I yield to my friend from Virginia for a closing comment, I just want to point out that the Populist Caucus is not anti-trade. We are not protectionist, but we want American companies and American employees and American consumers to be on a level playing field with their competitors. And when you have trade agreements that don't have the same level of commitment to enforceability, then you don't have a level playing field, and that's why fair trade agreements are important to protect all interests in the United States.

And with that, I want to yield back to my young friend from Virginia for some closing comments and want to thank him for the important contributions and voice he has added to our caucus.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you for yielding. I just want to take a moment on this issue of trade.

I think there's an attitude among the elites and among the mainstream media that assumes anything other

than blind, free trade is somehow idiotic, and there's a concern that this populism is about mob rule. Well, populist values aren't about pitchforks. They're about pragmatic results.

And I think for every model someone can show me on free trade, I can show you reality and empirics. This is not about a theory cooked up in academia about trade. It's about the reality of how the tiger economies and others have competed. It has not been some blind march to trade liberalization. It has been smart, strategic decisions by each of those countries to play to their comparative advantages.

I think that we have been negotiating from a position of weakness in these trade deals instead of negotiating from strength, and I think it's cost the middle class and the working class jobs. I think sometimes there's an incredibly naive attitude by those who would look down their noses at those who would engage in middle class and populist values, when in fact I think the empirics are on our side.

So I think what's important in this, again, is not that we pick up the pitchforks but that we produce results. I think what we're about is looking at pragmatic solutions that take back some of the raw deals that the middle class has gotten for the last 20 years, particularly the last few years, and starts to stand up for those middle-class families and working class families who are getting up every morning and working hard and playing by the rules and suddenly being asked to bear the brunt of everyone else's mistakes.

□ 2045

THE SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVIL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here tonight. Before my colleagues leave the floor, I hope they can hear a little bit of an alternative viewpoint, that being that this news flash, for especially my colleague from Iowa, corporations don't pay taxes, Mr. Speaker. Corporations collect those taxes from end users, consumers, retail people, and then they aggregate the taxes from the consumers and they pass them on to the Federal Government or State government or whatever the tax collecting body might be.

For that reason, no matter what the circumstances are, we are not going to be able to chase these corporations. We're not going to be able to chase these corporations around the world and collect that taxes from them because they will always find another way to pay taxes or, of course, the obligation they have it to pass it onto the consumer.

This is a fundamental principle when it comes to holding this economy together and how we're going to build the

economy in this country and how we're going to compete with the rest of the world. If we get that wrong, if we get it wrong and we think that we can somehow squeeze this capital out of these corporations that have lost about 40 percent of their asset value over the last year or so if you just simply look at the Dow, you'll find out that you can drive this free-market economy into oblivion and the free world will not make progress.

So we need to get that fundamental principle correct. We can't simply get corporations to pay taxes without them passing it on to consumers. And that is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker.

I didn't come to talk about that, but as I listened to my colleagues from the Populist Caucus—I discovered a new caucus here in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker—I raise another issue, the very vague and undefinable position of being for fair trade.

If someone stands up and says they're for fair trade, that means they're not for free trade. They can be for free trade and for smart trade, but you can't be for fair trade and also be for free trade.

Now that might seem like a little bit of alliteration gobbledegook, Mr. Speaker, but the truth is that there is no such thing as fair. Anyone who has raised more than one child—two or more children, I might further define—understands there's no such thing as fair. A three-year old can figure out that their four-year old brother or sister got an extra benefit along the way. They'll argue: That's not fair. As soon as they argue that, of course its subjective.

There's no such thing as fair when it comes to raising children, there's no such thing as fair when it comes to trade, because another country will have a different view on what is fair trade compared to what we will here in the United States.

Those are the fundamental principles. If we go down this path of this nice feeling rhetoric of fair trade as opposed to having justice and equity and balance and free marketing, if we go down this path of seeking to tax corporations and punish them, then we will continually be frustrated by trying to shape a policy that will never be achieved.

And that would be my comments to the gentleman who I think gave a heartfelt presentation here over the last hour, Mr. Speaker.

I didn't come, as I said, to talk about that. I came here to the floor of the House of Representatives tonight to talk about an issue that has to do with innocent unborn human life and these timeless values of the sacredness of the unborn child and the sacredness of all human life.

I have often made this case, especially to our high school and our middle school students, but also across this country, that we have these rights that come from God, and they are delineated in the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Speaker.

What our Founders drafted in the Declaration of Independence are the right to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That was not a random stream from the quill of Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Speaker. That was very specific, very carefully thought out, very prosaic designed phrase—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Prioritized rights, Mr. Speaker. That right to life—the right to life is paramount to anyone's liberty. And the right to liberty is paramount to pursuit of happiness.

So let me say that in my pursuit of happiness, if I should encroach upon someone's liberty, my pursuit of happiness loses its right out of deference to a higher priority right of liberty trumps pursuit of happiness. In pursuit of liberty, if I were to choose a pursuit of liberty that would violate someone's right to life, the right to life trumps anyone's pursuit of liberty.

So our Founders understood these are prioritized rights. There's a right to life. That human life is sacred in all of its forms and we have to choose a time, we have to choose an instant when life begins because we simply cannot err. So I choose that instant at conception. Today, it's conception/fertilization. When that happens, we have the biological beginning of life.

I believe that's the moment that God puts the soul in that little child. From that instant on, they're a unique individual. There will never be another one identical to that unique individual. And they are all the solutions to the problems in the world, aside from those that come from above, come from those little children that are coming into this world.

They have a right to life. We need to guarantee that right to life. That right to life trumps anyone's right to liberty, as much as the right to liberty trumps anyone else's pursuit of happiness.

I can continue to give these examples, Mr. Speaker, but I think where we are at this point is, having laid the foundation, I recognize I have the gentleman here from New Jersey, who has, I think, put together a very strong and compelling case here in this Congress; someone who I can count on every time to be with us every day as we stand up for the innocent unborn human life. He's someone who brings a passion to the scholarship, the conviction, the faith, the core principles to this cause, an individual I get to count as a friend and a colleague and someone who it's an honor for me to be serve with.

I'd yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend and colleague, Mr. KING, for his leadership, for his consistency in promoting human rights, and for bringing to this floor tonight another opportunity for us to affirm the dignity and the value of all human life, including that of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, last week, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton visited the

Catholic Basilica of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Mexico City, presented bouquet of flowers on behalf of the American people—a very nice gesture—and then went on to Houston, Texas, to receive the Margaret Sanger Award from Planned Parenthood.

In her remarks, Secretary Clinton said she was "in awe"—I repeat, "in awe"—of Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood. To our distinguished Secretary of State, I respectfully ask: Are you kidding? In "awe" of Margaret Sanger, who said in 1921, "Eugenics is the most adequate and thorough avenue to the solution of racial, political, and social problems." And who also said in 1922, "The most merciful thing that a family does to one of its infant members is to kill it."

Later, in 1939, Sanger wrote, "We should hire three or four colored ministers, preferably with social service backgrounds and with engaging personalities." She wrote, "The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We don't want the word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population," she goes on, "and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members."

Secretary Clinton in her speech said that Margaret Sanger's life and leadership was "one of the most transformational in the entire history of the human race." Mr. Speaker, transformational, yes. But not for the better if one happens to be poor, disenfranchised, weak, a person of color, vulnerable, or among the many so-called undesirables who Sanger would exclude and exterminate from the human race.

To me, and to many, including my distinguished colleague in the well, the juxtaposition of the last week's two very public events in Mexico City and in Houston bring into sharp focus two huge and irreconcilable world views.

On the one hand, the miracle of Our Lady of Guadalupe has for five centuries brought a message of hope, faith, peace, reconciliation and protection for the weakest, most vulnerable among us. On the other hand, each year, Margaret Sanger's Planned Parenthood kills approximately 300,000 unborn baby girls and boys in their abortion clinics scattered throughout the United States.

Worldwide, the loss of innocent human life at the hands of Planned Parenthood is in the millions. Planned Parenthood even supports the hideous brain-sucking method of abortion called partial birth abortion.

On a visit to the Basilica in Mexico City in 1999, Pope John Paul II publicly entrusted protection of all at-risk human life, including especially unborn children and their mothers, to Our Lady of Guadalupe because the miracle she wrought 500 years ago resulted in an end to the barbaric practice of human sacrifice to a serpent God that claimed anywhere between 20,000 and 50,000 victims a year.

Indeed, the miraculous story of Our Lady of Guadalupe, known so well especially in Latin America, but really around the world, has been extraordinarily compelling and inspirational for centuries.

In 1531, the Blessed Mother appeared to Juan Diego, a native American at Tepeyac, near Mexico City, and asked that a church be built on the site of the apparition. The Catholic bishop was skeptical and asked for a sign. At the behest of the Blessed Mother, and despite the fact it was winter, Juan Diego gathered roses from the site into his tilma for presentation to the Bishop.

When Juan Diego met with Bishop Juan de Zumarraga with the roses tucked under his apron, a miraculous image suddenly appeared on the cloth. The Bishop was stunned, and he believed. The image of the Blessed Mother wasn't painted. There are no brush strokes. To this day, the image defies all scientific explanation as to its origin.

Within a few years of the miracle, more than 9 million Aztecs converted to Christianity and a strong devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe began that continues to this day. Each year, some 18 million to 20 million pilgrims visit the miraculous image in Mexico City.

Last Thursday, Hillary Clinton visited the shrine. On Friday, she paid homage to Planned Parenthood and to Margaret Sanger.

Margaret Sanger is the founder of Planned Parenthood. She was a self-described pro-abortionist eugenicist and a racist who considered charity care for impoverished, disenfranchised women, including women of color, especially pregnant women, to be "cruel."

In her book, "The Pivot of Civilization," Margaret Sanger devoted an entire chapter that she entitled: "The Cruelty of Charity," to her inhumane case for not helping—and I repeat that—not helping poor pregnant women with prenatal and maternal care.

Sanger said in the book—and I read her book—"We are paying for and even submitting to the dictates of an ever increasing, unceasingly spawning class of human beings who never should have been born at all."

In chapter 5—again, chapter 5 is called: "The Cruelty of Charity"—she writes, "Organized charity itself is the symptom of a malignant social disease." Sanger writes, "Those vast, complex, interrelated organizations aiming to control and diminish the spread of misery and destruction and all the menacing evils that spring out of this sinisterly fertile soil are the surest sign that our civilization has bred, is breeding, and is perpetuating constantly increasing numbers of defectives, delinquents, and dependents." That's Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood.

She continues, "My criticism therefore is not directed at the failure of philanthropy but rather at its success." Sanger goes on to say, "There's

a special type of philanthropy or benevolence now widely advertised and advocated both as a Federal program and as worthy of private endowment, which strikes me," that is to say Sanger, "as being more insidiously injurious than any other. This concerns itself directly with the function of maternity and aims to supply gratis medical and nursing facilities to slum mothers.

"Such women are to be visited by nurses and receive instruction in the hygiene of pregnancy, to be guided in making arrangements for confinement, to be invited to come to the doctors' clinics for examination and supervision. They are, we are informed, to receive adequate care during pregnancy, at confinement, and for 1 month afterwards. Thus, are mothers and babies to be saved, childbearing is to be made safe."

Construing to demean the generosity of pregnancy care centers, Margaret Sanger goes on to say, "The work of the maternity centers in the various American cities, which they have already been established and in which they are supported by private contributions and endowment, it is hardly necessary to point out is carried out among the poor and the most docile section of the city, among mothers least able, through poverty and ignorance, to afford the care and attention necessary for successful maternity.

"The effect of maternity endowments of maternity centers supported by private philanthropy would have perhaps already have had exactly the most dysgenic tendency. The new government program would facilitate the function of maternity among the very classes in which the absolute necessity is to discourage it.

"Such benevolence," she goes on to say, "is not merely superficial and nearsighted." Sanger continues, "It conceals a stupid cruelty. Aside from the question of the unfitness of many women to become mothers, aside from the very definite deterioration in the human stock that such programs would inevitably hasten, we may question its value even through the unfortunate mother.

□ 2100

Simon concludes, "The most serious charge that can be brought against modern benevolence is that it encourages"—and I say this again—"the perpetuation of defectives, delinquents, and dependents." Such audacity, such an inhumane view of human life.

Mr. Speaker, in her speech at the Planned Parenthood gala accepting the Margaret Sanger award—and I have many other quotes from Sanger that I will put into the RECORD, and I invite Members and the American people to look at those quotes, and there is so much more.

But in her speech last Friday, Secretary Clinton said she admired Sanger for her vision, was in awe of her, and that Margaret Sanger's work here and

in the United States and certainly across the globe is not done.

Translated, "not done" means more abortions here in the United States, in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, the world. Planned Parenthood's mission statement, documents, and work in the field make it absolutely clear that they seek a global unfettered right to commit violence against unborn children at all stages of development. Planned Parenthood seeks integration of all health care with abortion, with no conscience rights whatsoever for medical practitioners, no parental consent or notification whatsoever for minors. And all of this paid for by the United States taxpayer.

Which begs the question, Mr. Speaker. Is our Secretary of State unaware of Margaret Sanger's inhumane beliefs? Was she not briefed on Margaret Sanger's cruel and reckless disregard for poor, pregnant women? Respectfully, Secretary Clinton should at a minimum return the Sanger award.

More importantly, Congress and the White House must at long last take a long, hard, second look at the multimillion, almost billion, dollar corporation called Planned Parenthood, Child Abuse Incorporated.

Let's be honest, Mr. Speaker. Abortion is violence against children. It dismembers and chemically poisons a child to death. It hurts women physically, psychologically, and spiritually. There is nothing whatsoever compassionate, benevolent, ennobling, benign, or empowering about abortion. It is a violation of a child's fundamental human rights.

Rather than partnering with Planned Parenthood and like-minded NGOs to promote abortion worldwide with hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, the United States should affirm the inherent value, dignity, worth of both victims of abortion, mother and child. We need to promote nonviolent, life-affirming solutions to women both here as well as abroad. Women deserve better than abortion. We should always and in every way affirm the precious lives of both. And on that score, Margaret Sanger and far too many others would disagree.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take that second look at Planned Parenthood. It is time to respect the value and the dignity of all human life.

Mr. Speaker, last week, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton visited the Catholic Basilica of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Mexico City, presented a bouquet of flowers on behalf of the American people—a nice gesture—and then went on to Houston, Texas to receive the Margaret Sanger Award from Planned Parenthood.

In her remarks, Secretary Clinton said she was "in awe" of Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood. To our distinguished Secretary of State, I respectfully ask, are you kidding? In "awe" of Margaret Sanger who said in 1921 "Eugenics is . . . the most adequate and thorough avenue to the solution of racial, political and social problems" and in 1922 said, "The most merciful thing that a

family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.”

Later in 1939 Sanger wrote “We should hire three or four colored ministers, preferably with social-service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities. The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We don’t want the word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members.”

Secretary Clinton said in her speech that Margaret Sanger’s “life and leadership” was “one of the most transformational in the entire history of the human race.” Mr. Speaker, transformational yes, but not for the better if one happens to be poor, disenfranchised, weak, disabled, vulnerable, or among the many so called undesirables who Sanger would exclude and exterminate from the human race.

To me—to many—the juxtaposition of last weeks two very public events—in Mexico City and in Houston—bring into sharp focus, two huge and irreconcilable world views.

On the one hand, the miracle of Our Lady of Guadalupe has for 5 centuries brought a message of hope, faith, love and protection for the weakest, most vulnerable among us. On the other hand, each year Margaret Sanger’s Planned Parenthood kills approximately 300,000 unborn children in their abortion clinics throughout the United States. Worldwide the loss of innocent human life at the hands of Planned Parenthood is in the millions. Planned Parenthood even supports the hideous brain sucking method of abortion called partial birth abortion.

On a visit to the Basilica in Mexico City in 1999, Pope John Paul II publicly entrusted protection of all at risk innocent human life, including and especially unborn children and their mothers, to Our Lady of Guadalupe because the miracle she wrought 500 years ago resulted in an end to the barbaric practice of human sacrifice to a serpent god that claimed 20,000 to 50,000 victims a year.

Indeed, the miraculous story of Our Lady of Guadalupe has been extraordinarily compelling and inspirational for centuries.

In 1531, the Blessed Mother appeared to Juan Diego, a Native American at Tepeyac, near Mexico City, and asked that a church be built on the site of the apparition.

The Catholic Bishop was skeptical and asked for a sign.

At the behest of the Blessed Mother, and despite the fact that it was winter, Juan Diego gathered roses from the site into his tilma for presentation to the Bishop.

When Juan Diego met with Bishop Juan de Zumarraga with the roses tucked in his apron, a miraculous image suddenly appeared on the cloth.

The Bishop was stunned, and believed. The image of the Blessed Mother wasn’t painted—there are no brush strokes—and to this day the image defies all scientific explanation as to its origin.

Within a few years of the miracle, more than 9 million Aztecs converted to Christianity and strong devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe began, that continues to this day. Each year some 18–20 million pilgrims visit the miraculous image in Mexico City.

Last Thursday, Hillary Clinton visited the Shrine. Then on Friday she paid homage to Planned Parenthood and Margaret Sanger.

Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood was a self-described pro-abortion eugenicist and racist who considered charity care for impoverished, disenfranchised women, including women of color, especially pregnant women, to be “cruel.” In her book, the *Pivot of Civilization*, Margaret Sanger devoted an entire chapter entitled “The Cruelty of Charity” to her inhumane case of not helping—I repeat not helping—poor, pregnant women with prenatal and maternal care.

Sanger said in the book, “We are paying for and even submitting to the dictates of an ever increasing, unceasingly spawning class of human beings who never should have been born at all.” In Chapter 5 of that book Sanger writes:

“ . . . Organized charity itself is the symptom of a malignant social disease.

“Those vast, complex, interrelated organizations aiming to control and to diminish the spread of misery and destitution and all the menacing evils that spring out of this sinisterly fertile soil, are the surest sign that our civilization has bred, is breeding and is perpetuating constantly increasing numbers of defectives, delinquents and dependents.”

Sanger continues, “My criticism, therefore, is not directed at the ‘failure’ of philanthropy, but rather at its success. . . .”

Sanger goes on to say, “there is a special type of philanthropy or benevolence, now widely advertised and advocated, both as a federal program and as worthy of private endowment, which strikes me (Sanger) as being more insidiously injurious than any other. This concerns itself directly with the function of maternity, and aims to supply gratis medical and nursing facilities to slum mothers. Such women are to be visited by nurses and to receive instruction in the “hygiene of pregnancy”; to be guided in making arrangements for confinements; to be invited to come to the doctors’ clinics for examination and supervision. They are, we are informed, to “receive adequate care during pregnancy, at confinement, and for one month afterward. Thus are mothers and babies to be saved, ‘Childbearing is to be made safe.’”

Construing to demean the generosity of pregnancy centers Sanger continues, “the work of the maternity centers in the various American cities in which they have already been established and in which they are supported by private contributions and endowment, it is hardly necessary to point out, is carried on among the poor and more docile sections of the city, among mothers least able, through poverty and ignorance, to afford the care and attention necessary for successful maternity. . . . The effect of maternity endowments and maternity centers supported by private philanthropy would have, perhaps already had, exactly the most dysgenic tendency. The new government program would facilitate the function of maternity among the very classes in which the absolute necessity is to discourage it.”

Such “benevolence” is not merely superficial and nearsighted.

Sanger continues to write: “it conceals a stupid cruelty . . . Aside from the question of the unfitness of many women to become mothers, aside from the very definite deterioration in the human stock that such programs would inevitable hasten, we may question its value even to the normal though unfortunate mother.”

Sanger concludes, “the most serious charge that can be brought against modern ‘benevolence’ is that it encourages the perpetuation of defectives, delinquents and dependents.”

Sanger also said:

“The most merciful thing that a family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.”

“Birth control must lead ultimately to a cleaner race.”

Margaret Sanger, *Woman, Morality, and Birth Control*. New York: New York Publishing Company, 1922. Page 12.

“We should hire three or four colored ministers, preferably with social-service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities. The most successful education approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We don’t want the word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members.”

Margaret Sanger’s December 19, 1939 letter to Dr. Clarence Gamble, 255 Adams Street, Milton, Massachusetts. Original source: Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, North Hampton, Massachusetts. Also described in Linda Gordon’s *Woman’s Body, Woman’s Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America*. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1976.

“Eugenic sterilization is an urgent need . . . We must prevent multiplication of this bad stock.”

Margaret Sanger, April 1933 *Birth Control Review*.

“Eugenics is . . . the most adequate and thorough avenue to the solution of racial, political and social problems.

Margaret Sanger. “The Eugenic Value of Birth Control Propaganda.” *Birth Control Review*, October 1921, page 5.

“As an advocate of birth control I wish . . . to point out that the unbalance between the birth rate of the ‘unfit’ and the ‘fit,’ admittedly the greatest present menace to civilization, can never be rectified by the inauguration of a cradle competition between these two classes. In this matter, the example of the inferior classes, the fertility of the feeble-minded, the mentally defective, the poverty-stricken classes, should not be held up for emulation . . .

“On the contrary, the most urgent problem today is how to limit and discourage the overfertility of the mentally and physically defective.”

Margaret Sanger. “The Eugenic Value of Birth Control Propaganda.” *Birth Control Review*, October 1921, page 5.

“The campaign for birth control is not merely of eugenic value, but is practically identical with the final aims of eugenics.”

Margaret Sanger. “The Eugenic Value of Birth Control Propaganda.” *Birth Control Review*, October 1921, page 5.

“Our failure to segregate morons who are increasing and multiplying . . . demonstrates our foolhardy and extravagant sentimentalism . . . [Philanthropists] encourage the healthier and more normal sections of the world to shoulder the burden of unthinking and indiscriminate fecundity of others; which brings with it, as I think the reader must agree, a dead weight of human waste. Instead of decreasing and aiming to eliminate the stocks that are most detrimental to the future of the race and the world, it tends to render them to a menacing degree dominant . . . We are paying

for, and even submitting to, the dictates of an ever-increasing, unceasingly spawning class of human beings who never should have been born at all."

Margaret Sanger. *The Pivot of Civilization*, 1922. Chapter on "The Cruelty of Charity," pages 116, 122, and 189. Swarthmore College Library edition.

"The undeniably feeble-minded should, indeed, not only be discouraged but prevented from propagating their kind."

Margaret Sanger, quoted in Charles Valenza. "Was Margaret Sanger a Racist?" *Family Planning Perspectives*, January–February 1985, page 44.

"The third group [of society] are those irresponsible and reckless ones having little regard for the consequences of their acts, or whose religious scruples prevent their exercising control over their numbers. Many of this group are diseased, feeble-minded, and are of the pauper element dependent upon the normal and fit members of society for their support. There is no doubt in the minds of all thinking people that the procreation of this group should be stopped."

Margaret Sanger. Speech quoted in *Birth Control: What It Is, How It Works, What It Will Do*. The Proceedings of the First American Birth Control Conference. Held at the Hotel Plaza, New York City, November 11–12, 1921. Published by the Birth Control Review, Gothic Press, pages 172 and 174.

"The marriage bed is the most degenerative influence in the social order . . ."

Margaret Sanger (editor). *The Woman Rebel*, Volume I, Number 1. Reprinted in *Woman and the New Race*. New York: Brentanos Publishers, 1922.

"[Our objective is] unlimited sexual gratification without the burden of unwanted children . . ."

Margaret Sanger (editor). *The Woman Rebel*, Volume I, Number 1. Reprinted in *Woman and the New Race*. New York: Brentanos Publishers, 1922.

"Give dysgenic groups [people with 'bad genes'] in our population their choice of segregation or [compulsory] sterilization."

Margaret Sanger, April 1932 *Birth Control Review*.

In her speech at the Planned Parenthood Gala, accepting the Margaret Sanger award, Secretary Clinton said she admired Sanger for her "vision," was in "awe of her" and that "Margaret Sanger's work here in the United States and certainly across the globe is not done."

Translated, "not done" means more abortions here in the United States, in Latin America, Africa, Asia—the world. Planned Parenthood's mission statement, documents, and work in the field make it absolutely clear that they seek a global unfettered right to commit violence against unborn children at all stages of development. Planned Parenthood seeks integration of all health care with abortion, with no conscience rights whatsoever for medical practitioners, no parental consent or notification for minors, and all paid for by the taxpayers.

Which begs the question: is our Secretary of State unaware of Margaret Sanger's unhumane beliefs? Was she not briefed on Margaret Sanger's cruel and reckless disregard for poor pregnant women? Respectfully, Secretary Clinton should at a minimum return the Sanger award. More importantly,

Congress and the White House must, at long last take a long hard second look at the multi-million corporation Planned Parenthood—Child Abuse Inc.

Let's be honest, Mr. Speaker. Abortion is violence against children. It dismembers and chemically poisons a child to death. It hurts women physically and psychologically and spiritually. There is nothing whatsoever compassionate, benevolent, ennobling, benign or empowering about abortion. It is a violation of a child's fundamental human rights.

Rather than partnering with Planned Parenthood and like minded NGOs to promote abortion worldwide, with hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, the United States should affirm the inherent value, dignity and worth of both victims of abortion—mother and child. We need to promote both at home and abroad. We should always and in every way affirm the precious lives of both. On that score, Margaret Sanger and far too many others would disagree.

I thank my good friend and yield back to him.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. And I appreciate the privilege to stand here and hear those words, the nonviolent, life-affirming philosophy that we are here and that we join together in, and the question that was presented, that is this question: Did Hillary Clinton understand? Did the Secretary of State understand the cruel, racist, elitist philosophy of Margaret Sanger in whose name she accepted the award? Did she understand the implications that come with such an award?

And I don't know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. But I have to believe that someone who has been engaged in public policy all of her life, even as an undergraduate at Yale, this is not something that has not crossed her mind. I cannot believe that the Secretary of State would be ignorant of the philosophy of Margaret Sanger. I cannot believe that. If that were the case, then I would suspect that she is ignorant of many other things, and I don't buy that. I think this is a well-educated, very astute lady, a smart lady.

And as I listened to the gentleman from New Jersey's presentation, I think about something that takes us even to another level here, and this is a statement where we have an individual that has been nominated into this administration in a confirmation, a Senate confirmation position, Office of Legal Counsel, who actually is even more of an advocate of abortion and someone who even takes the position of Margaret Sanger to another level, and that is Dawn Johnsen, Office of Legal Counsel. And I have a quote.

Now, Dawn Johnsen has been appointed, Mr. Speaker, to head up the Office of Legal Counsel. This is the most influential, most powerful position that you have never heard of if you are an average, regular person in America.

The Office of Legal Counsel provides opinions on the constitutionality of the activities of the entire administration, and gives advice to the President of the United States.

The Office of Legal Counsel, the person who heads that up, this would be Dawn Johnsen, should she be confirmed by the United States Senate, has the opportunity to whisper into the President's ear over and over again Constitutional recommendations, which are actually considered to be binding precedent unless it happens to be overturned by the courts, so very seriously taken, and the opportunity to advocate for policy.

This is Dawn Johnsen, who says that: Abortion should not be rare. And actually went so far as to take issue with Hillary Clinton whom, in the presidential campaign, who said abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. At least rare is the right direction to go, and legal is another question. But here is Dawn Johnsen's statement:

The notion of legal restrictions as some kind of reasonable compromise, perhaps to help make abortion safe, legal, and rare, thus proves nonsensical.

In other words, she even took issue with Hillary Clinton's position that abortion should at least be rare. I will give Hillary Clinton that, Mr. Speaker, that she has at least made the statement, whether she has followed through on it or not. And she has accepted the Margaret Sanger award, which would actually contradict this statement about abortion being rare.

Margaret Sanger's philosophy was very elitist, very racist, very much focused on the idea of eugenics, and that we could perfect the species of *Homo sapiens* by selective breeding processes and by selective abortions. And data shows that in the African American community, as much as 50 percent of the African American babies conceived in the United States of America meet their death by abortion. Half of the population that would be here, that could laugh, live, love, play, contribute to this society, be part of this whole America, could enjoy a right to life and the right to fulfillment of that life lose that right to life in the abortion clinics.

And if I listened right to the gentleman from New Jersey, 300,000 altogether meet their end annually here in the United States of America at the hands of Planned Parenthood and their abortion clinics, 300,000 out of perhaps a number that is around 4,000 a day, multiplied across every day here in the United States. And this is just the United States of America.

Then we have the Advocacy for International Abortion, which comes continually here. Every year we deal with that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I remember this debate that we had on the floor here where we stand. It was the first debate on the Mexico City policy that took place in the 110th Congress, the first debate on Mexico City policy that fell underneath the gavel of Speaker PELOSI.

And I remember those of us who stand up for innocent, unborn human life lost that debate and lost that vote

here. And I will never forget looking across over on this side, Mr. Speaker, where I saw the advocates that thought that they wanted to compel American taxpayers to fund abortions in foreign lands clapping, cheering, jumping up and down, hugging each other, maybe even in tears of joy, for compelling Americans to fund abortions in foreign lands, something that is abhorrent to I believe a majority of Americans. And yet, the cheer came up over here, Mr. Speaker. Nearly impossible to understand.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

Back in 1984, when President Reagan first announced the Mexico City policy, it was designed to separate abortion from family planning. It got its name, as I know the gentleman knows, Mexico City policy because it was at a U.N. conference that the venue was in Mexico City; hence, its name. But it was a very well calibrated, very thoughtful policy which said that there ought to be a very bright line of demarcation between family planning and abortion, and that we would only fund those foreign nongovernmental organizations that divested themselves of lobbying, promoting, and performing abortions as a method of family planning.

It was a policy that worked. NGOs got funding. We are the largest provider of family planning in the world. But now, the organizations that will receive those funds, and we are talking about over one-half billion dollars per year of taxpayer funding, will be used to promote abortions in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia, Europe, everywhere where the law still protects and safeguards the sanctity of human life.

Most of the African countries, most of the countries in Latin America protect the lives of their innocent unborn children as a matter of human rights. Now, abortion organizations, backed with huge subsidies from the Federal Government—and President Obama was the one who signed the executive order that reversed the Mexico City policy. And, as the gentleman said, and I offered the amendment on the floor that he was talking about that regrettably failed, the misguided cheers and happiness about giving money to an organization that completely targets innocent babies in the womb for destruction.

We live in 2009. As the gentleman knows, ultrasound technology, prenatal surgeries have shattered the myth that an unborn child is human and alive. Of course they are. A child in utero may need a blood transfusion or microsurgery or some other intervention, medically speaking, to abate or mitigate some anomaly before birth. I chair the Spina Bifida Caucus. Some of the early interventions for spina bifida children can have a marvelous quality of life impact later on, from birth on. But you do it before birth.

Bernard Nathanson, as my distinguished colleague knows, was the lead-

ing abortionist in the seventies. He founded, along with Betty Friedan and Lawrence Lader, NARAL, one of the biggest pro-abortion organizations in this country. He changed positions after he was doing surgeries and looking at the unborn child as a patient at St. Luke's Hospital in New York. He ran an abortion clinic, was a big activist for years, and then became a pro-lifer. And he wrote in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, and I quote, "I have come to the agonizing conclusion that I have presided over 60,000 deaths." And then he became a pro-lifer. And now he has spoken out for many years on behalf of the human rights of the unborn, and that the women are injured, the babies are victimized and killed, and that this death and destruction to our offspring and to our women and to mothers must cease.

We now are exporting. We don't export enough. We certainly don't export enough commodities. Our economy has been hurting for a number of months now and even years. What we are exporting, tragically, is abortion, and the taxpayers of America are the ones who are subsidizing that, enabling that promotion of abortion in Africa and Latin America and elsewhere.

There was a famous movie years ago, and my friend and colleague from Iowa probably saw it, *The Ugly American*. You know, I love what we can do foreign policy-wise to help and to ennoble and to make healthier people around the world, whether it be on AIDS treatments and all the other things that occur internationally, hunger alleviation, clean water, safe blood.

□ 2115

But abortion takes all that. It tells people in the developing world, just like the vision of Margaret Sanger that we don't want you. That your children are not—are dehumanized and are expendable. As the great Henry Hyde used to say, liable to extermination. You can terminate the innocent and inconvenient with such ease. Who is to speak out for them? They can't speak for themselves because of their immaturity and their dependency.

So I congratulate the gentleman because the time has come, the time has truly come for America to begin a great awakening when it comes to the value, the dignity and the sanctity of human life. Abortion is violence against children. Despite all of the platitudes, all of the cheap sophistry that routinely is employed to cover up abortion, it is violence. Dismembering a child, chemically poisoning a child, inducing a miscarriage whereby the child then dies very early because of the inability to cope after being separated from the mother, all of these methods of abortion have one goal in mind, the killing of the unborn child.

Recently I watched and read a statement that Father Pavone, a priest for life actually put together. And he talked about Dr. Haskell, who is the man who came up with the partial-

birth abortion method. And one of the main reasons why, and maybe the primary reason why that method was crafted, where a baby is half born, his or her brain is pierced in the back of the head and the brains are literally sucked out, was to ensure that the abortion didn't produce a live birth. Years ago, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, which is just south of my district, had a big story called "The Dreaded Complication" and spoke about the fact that every year something on the order of 500 children survived later-term abortions only to die maybe a day later, several hours later, but some went on to be adopted. For the abortionist, this was a complication, a dreaded one. So Haskell and others decided to do away with that possibility by completely collapsing the brain cavity and sucking the brains out of a child. We get accused of inflammatory rhetoric by the pro-abortion side when we describe what it is that they do in abortion clinics. It is violence. It hurts women.

And finally, as Dr. Elvita King has said so eloquently—the niece of Dr. Martin Luther King, a woman who used to be on the other side of this issue, who had two abortions herself, and has spoken out on behalf of the unborn child and his or her mother—abortion is the ultimate civil rights movement of our day. She is the niece of Martin Luther King. She knows a thing or two about human rights and civil rights. And she says that as a society, it is time to look carefully, get rid of the platitudes, get rid of the euphemisms that have stifled true debate, words like "choice." Choice to do what? To destroy an unborn child in a very vicious way. We need to protect both.

One of the most beautiful things of the group that she is a part of called "Silent No More," made up exclusively of women who have had abortions, is that they reach out to women who are in crisis, who have the post-traumatic stress disorder, have grave misgivings, not right away, but maybe a couple years later, maybe several years later, and say there is a path to reconciliation and peace. That is what the pro-life movement is all about. We have never been about judgment. We have always been about enfranchisement. Protect the baby. Protect the mother in the first place. And for those who have already had abortions, who like Martin Luther King's niece, Elvita King in *Silent No More* and other women who have bravely spoken out on behalf of the unborn and their mothers, there are two victims, one is killed, one is injured. They need our help, our love and our compassion.

Unfortunately, they don't get that from the other side. It is called "empowerment." There is nothing empowering about destroying an unborn child. And it is time—and I would hope, as the gentleman would hope, that there would be a campaign that men and women in America, Members of

Congress, who have for a long time voted the pro-abortion side, would take a second look, look at Planned Parenthood this second time. To look at, as you pointed out, what Dawn Johnson has said when she says "Women are not fetal containers," that degrades the beauty and the magnificence of procreation and of life and the way we all came into this world.

So I thank the gentleman for this time and hope that there will be a new, a re-evaluation, a new reappraisal of what the culture of death has done. Fifty million unborn children have been killed since 1973, a staggering loss of human life. And as you have pointed out previously, Mr. KING, there has been a very suspicious disproportionality when it comes to how many African Americans have been killed. And many, including Dr. King and others, are more than suspicious, especially given Margaret Sanger's and others' viewpoint about who is desirable and who is undesirable. So I strongly urge this re-evaluation. It needs to take place now.

Finally, and I said "finally" before, but this will be final, President Obama sadly and tragically, with the enormous support and the wellspring of goodwill that is being afforded him, is the abortion President. Every move he has made, whether it be the reversal of Mexico City, his embrace of the Freedom of Choice Act, which may come up on this floor some time, we don't know when, the move to get rid of conscience protections that men and women in the medical profession absolutely need so they are not complicit in killing innocent human life, taxpayer funding for abortion, the embrace of embryonic stem-cell research at a time when induced pluripotent stem cells, which are embryo like but do not require the killing of an embryo and can come right off your skin and mine and be manipulated in a way that will be lifesaving, cord blood, all the adult stem cells, the alternatives to embryonic work, embryonic has not worked, and yet with great fanfare he has embraced that at every turn. And the one that the gentleman brings to the floor tonight, Dawn Johnson, in what is truly an outrageous view, an inhumane view, a tragic view towards the sanctity of life, people of her kind and people with her perspective are embedded all over the Obama administration and will daily be promoting and proffering policies, very often in a stealthy way, that will promote the culture of death.

And to our friends in Africa, Latin America and elsewhere, watch out. The abortionists are coming. And they are coming from the Obama administration. I thank my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. And I would hope that he can stand by. I have a couple of questions I would like to present that way and first make a statement. And that is, Mr. Speaker, with regard to partial-birth abortion, it has occurred to me that if an abor-

tionist can go in and turn that child around so the baby is born breech, that being feet first, and bring that baby to delivery for everything but the head and in fact, part of the head, and then, hold the baby there so that the baby isn't fully born and then take a scalpel and insert that into the back of the skull and put some scissors in there and open up the hole and suck the brains out of that child while that child struggles for life and struggles for mercy, it occurs to me as I picked up the film, "Silent Scream" years ago when our children were about 10 or 12 years old and showed that to them one time, and one time was enough, that silent scream, the word of that movie that showed the violence of abortion, it occurs to me that this society can't abide the screams of the innocent. And so they had to devise a means of abortion that would stop the life of that innocent child an inch before that child could fill its lungs full of free air and scream for its own mercy. That, I think, is the psychology behind this. Even the abortionists couldn't stand the sound of the scream of the child screaming for its own mercy. And I think that is how partial-birth abortion was devised.

I would pose this question to the gentleman from New Jersey, and having been the individual that offered the amendment to preserve the Mexico City policy and having lost that debate and lost that vote on this floor, and having seen the display of glee and joy and hugging and clapping and cheering and perhaps even tears of joy on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, the joy that they were going to compel the American taxpayers to fund abortions in foreign lands, what kind of a person, the sons and daughters, the grandsons and granddaughters of Margaret Sanger, the mother of abortion, the mother of "family planning" in quotes, the eugenic idea of producing a more perfect race, Hitlerian idea, what could cause a person to be so full of joy about compelling you or me or the people who agree with us to fund abortions in foreign lands? I can't understand that, Mr. SMITH. And I would be very interested in your analysis.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I say to my good friend, Mr. KING, I have been offering the Mexico City Policy since 1984. I have been here for 29 years, and I offered it the first time. And I remember members on the other side of the aisle saying that none of the family planning NGOs will take the money with that kind of conditionality. They were so focused and filled with their wanting to provide abortions.

That didn't happen. NGOs lined up. The money went out the door. And we had that line of demarcation between abortion and family planning for years. Bill Clinton reversed it, and during the course of his presidency, we fought hard to restore it. And in the end, for the last 2 years of the Clinton administration, we had first a modified and then the full Mexico City Policy back.

President Bush, by executive order, re-established it, and family planning moneys flowed, but without abortion promotion or performance.

And then, President Obama, like I said, just a couple of days after being sworn in, re-established, or reversed I should say, the Mexico City Policy with more money now flowing to those organizations. Why the joy and the happiness on the side of those who promote abortion? It is bewildering in the extreme. Father Pavone's Web site, and I encourage people to check it out, he talks about a meeting when this Dr. Haskell, the man who devised this child-abuse method called partial-birth abortion, as you pointed out where the baby's brains are literally sucked out, he presented that method, as Father Pavone points out in one of his speeches, it actually has much about what happened in this conference, and the conference was filled with abortionists. And when the baby actually died, it was being killed, because he had it all on film, they broke into applause at the demise, at the death of that child.

That is pathetic. It is beyond tragic. I said during the debate, and remember Bill Clinton vetoed partial-birth abortion not once but twice, that when my young girls, and we have two girls, four children totally, but when they were young, if they were to play "doctor," the girls, and take their dolls as they had when they were 5 and 6, turn them around and pierce the back of their skulls and then suck their brains out, we would seek, as would any parent, immediate counseling. Something would be wrong. When someone embraces the death of a child, something is very, very dangerously wrong.

I have seen on this floor time and again—and I would say we won the debate, I would say to my friend, but lost the vote on Mexico City Policy. And when we have lost fights on partial-birth abortion, for example, not in vote count, but in vetoes by the previous administration, it never ceases to amaze me that one could be joyous over allowing, facilitating and enabling more death to children and more wounding of their mothers.

That is what this is all about. I believe passionately, and I have been in Congress 29 years, and I spend much of my time working on human rights issues, humanitarian issues around the world, whether it be in Africa working on human trafficking or on trying to mitigate and stop terrible things like torture. I wrote four torture victims relief acts—laws—they are not bills, they are laws, and many, many other laws, microcredit financing for the developing world, three human trafficking laws beginning with the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, I believe passionately in human rights. But birth is not the beginning of a person's life. We need to see it as an event that happens to each and every one of us, and that those children in utero are no less human and alive than you and me. They are definitely dependent.

They are immature, as is a newborn, as is a 1 year old. And a compassionate and sane society would seek to enfranchise, not disenfranchise.

So when they expressed on the other side, and a few on our side of the aisle, happiness over the loss of the Mexico City policy, it was very clear to me. I had nothing but sorrow because there is one predictable consequence, more dead babies and more wounded mothers.

I yield back.

□ 2130

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. And as I listened to that description of the audience breaking into applause at a video of a baby who has been a victim of partial birth abortion, had its brain sucked out and stopped struggling, it became apparent that the baby was dead, that they would cheer, break into applause, that indexes to the cheer and the applause and the hugging that went on here when the Mexico City Policy was defeated on the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker.

And I understood it differently. And I think it was because of a gap in the knowledge and experience that's been filled in by Mr. SMITH from New Jersey. I explained that emotion over here as not being a rational, logical emotion, but an emotion that simply divorced itself from the sacred nature of human life, and was simply cheering because they had scored a victory over our side.

And how could anyone go through life and think they had accomplished something by compelling others to fund abortions in foreign lands? That's a psychology that I cannot connect with, Mr. Speaker. And so I could only rationalize it on the part that they know we hold innocent life dear. We hold all human life dear. And we believe that it's sacred in all of its forms, from the instant at conception and fertilization to natural death.

And Mr. SMITH, among others, have been one of the stalwarts in leading and defending innocent human life, especially in this Congress. And I thought that that cheer was for having scored points against the value system, the core value system of those of us on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of that, because the people sitting inside that room who were watching that film of that partial birth abortion, the struggling child who ceased to struggle when it's obvious that the baby was dead, that broke into a cheer, they didn't do that because they scored points on the other side. That doesn't relate over here to a political contest which should always transcend our fundamental, timeless values. However I might try to rationalize their emotions, when you tie the two of them together, it's almost unexplainable. I can't explain an emotion or thought process that would want to end innocent human life and consider it to be a right, a fundamental right.

So I ask this question, and I ask this question continually in our public schools and our parochial schools across the land when I have the chance. And I say, especially to young people, you'll be called upon to make a profound moral decision in this society and this civilization; if you're 14, 15, 16, 18 years old, 19, 20 years old, you will, or you will be among those who will have to make that profound decision, the moral decision.

And you ask only two questions. It's very simple, and it's this simple. The first question is, do you believe in the sanctity of human life? Is human life sacred in all of its forms? Is your life sacred? Is the person next to you, is their life sacred, people on either side, are their lives sacred? And it becomes almost a universal yes. I've actually never had a student say, no, I don't think so. I don't think my life is sacred and I shouldn't be treated in a sacred fashion. I've never had that happen. They nod their heads. It's universal that we believe that life, human life is sacred in all of its forms.

So once we establish the answer, yes, to the first question, is human life sacred, the only question to follow that up with is, then at what instant does life begin? You have to choose an instant. And I describe it this way. You can't guess at it. What if somebody came by the gymnasium or the auditorium and stuck a gun in the door and turned their head the other way and pulled the trigger and ran down the hallway without looking back. If they were captured outside the building, you could ask them, did you kill somebody or didn't you? And their answer might be, I don't know. But we know that if the gymnasium emptied and there's someone in there who's dead, with a bullet hole in them, yes, the answer is, he did kill somebody.

And if it results in a dead baby, someone was killed. And you cannot guess when it comes to life. You can't err when it comes to life. You must choose that instant that life begins. It can't be a first trimester, a second trimester, a third trimester; it can't be viability outside the womb. We know it goes up beyond 24 weeks or below 24 weeks for viability today. There's no baby that's born, now, 9 months, full-term that really is viable without being nurtured by its mother and by its parents. And they've got to be nurtured. And so whether it's the instant before they're born or the instant after, when does life begin?

I remember asking that question when this first little miracle, that firstborn of our family, was put into my hands. And I looked at that child and I was struck by the awe of the miracle. And I don't remember that I thought this through on that day, but I remember going to work the next day and I was sitting there thinking this through. And I still believe there's a certain aura about that firstborn child.

And I asked myself, here's this miracle that's been in my arms within the

last hours. This little child, this miracle, could someone take his life today? And of course the answer is no. Could they have taken his life yesterday, the day he was born? No. Could they do so the minute after he was born? No. The minute before he was born? No. What about 10 minutes before or 2 hours before or a day or a week or a month before he was born? The answer is no, no and no, Mr. Speaker. And so if you can't do that, if it's abhorrent to us to think about the idea of ending the life of our unborn child a day, a week or a month before they're born, just as we couldn't think of that a day a week or a month after they're born, then we've got to take this back to an instant, an instant that their life begins. And it's that simple.

And this has become a political argument that's destroyed the lives of 50 million babies, to the point where we argue that this civilization has a hole in it, in the generation.

I remember standing down on the Mall, this would be, I believe, a year ago, January 22, on the March for Life. And if you looked out across that Mall, there were over 100,000 there that day. This year there was a far bigger number in the March for Life, many, many young people.

And I made the point that if you are under 30 years old, and you're standing next to somebody that's under 30 years old, look at each other. And the ghost of one-third of your generation stands between you. That's the aborted generation, the generation that didn't have that opportunity for life, the generation that are the victims of Margaret Sanger, the victims of a political agenda, the victims of a lack of belief in the sanctity of human life, the people that would argue that babies are inconvenient, that an abortion should never be rare, the people like Dawn Johnsen who would argue that mothers are fetal containers. My mother a fetal container? CHRIS SMITH's mother a fetal container? That the only emotion you feel—this is Dawn Johnsen again—the only emotion you feel when you have an abortion is relief, not trauma; that it never comes back to you; that it's simply off one's conscience.

We know that that has motivated—that women deserve better—the organization that CHRIS SMITH talked about.

Dawn Johnsen spoke that women who get pregnant are simply the losers in the contraceptive lottery, and that they no more consent to pregnancy than pedestrians consent to being struck by drunk drivers.

And yet, I'm standing in my kitchen on Sunday, talking with my daughter-in-law, who's the mother of our third grandchild. And I told her that I'm jealous because I'll never get to be a mom. And yet, no matter what she wants to do with her career, some of that career is going to be slowed down because she's busy being a mom.

And she looked at me and she said, I know you're jealous. You've told me that before. You'll never be a mom.

And I think being a mom is worth the tradeoff of slowing down my career because I think it's great being a mom.

And that's the love that flows. That lady is not a fetal container. She's a mother, a mother that's brought love to each of the children that God's gifted this family with, just like the millions and millions of mothers across the planet who have done so, done so out of love, out of faith, out of conviction.

And I can't understand the people that would cheer and celebrate the tax dollars of American people going to any place that provides abortion services and counseling.

That is what happens, Mr. Speaker. And I know the gentleman from New Jersey has a few more words.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Just a couple of final comments. And I again thank my friend and colleague for his leadership on this fundamental human rights issue of protecting the unborn child.

You know, the most persecuted minority in the world today are unborn children. The acceptable bias today is abortion. To be prejudiced against unborn children is somehow acceptable. It's certainly legal in this country. And that is a very significant tragedy for our society.

It is time we called it for what it is. It is child abuse, abortion. It is violence against children. It is prejudice. And I would hope that Members—you know, I've heard some of our finest leaders in the pro-life movement say over the years that Americans won't stop abortion until they see it. We have to push away the euphemisms that have cloaked this for the last three decades and figure it out, not figure it out, just simply spend some time focusing on what it is that the abortionist does. It is violence against children. It actually engenders pain for the unborn child.

My friend and colleague will know that 3 years ago, 4 years ago I offered legislation on this floor called the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act. We got 250 votes, bipartisan votes for at least advising a woman that, from at least the 20th week on, her child might feel significant pain. The evidence clearly suggests that a child who is killed by dismemberment or some other hideous method of abortion, feels pain that is up to four times more excruciating than a newborn or an older child because the nerve endings are so close to the skin, and the ability of the body to dampen pain has not matured sufficiently.

There's a method of abortion known as the D&E. The method literally involves hacking off the arms and the legs of an unborn child, decapitation, takes upwards of 30 minutes for that method to effectuate its kill. And at least in the beginning moments of that abortion, the child feels excruciating pain.

Today, because of the great work of people like Dr. Anand and others, when

prenatal surgeries are performed and the child needs to be surgically opened up to do some procedure that is benign and life-affirming, he or she gets anesthesia. An unborn child gets no such consideration. We treat animals with more benevolence and in a more caring way in terms of pain mitigation than we do unborn children.

That legislation should be on this floor. A child should not only not suffer the cruelty of being killed, but also the pain that goes along with it. Most Americans are woefully unaware. Some of my colleagues, our colleagues are probably woefully unaware as well that pain is real for these children as they die a death due to abortion.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I very much thank the gentleman from New Jersey. And it brings to mind an image that many of us have seen of an in-utero surgery where that—not only does that little unborn child feel the pain, but that little child reached up out of the incision and grasped the finger of the surgeon. I'll never forget that image. And it was something that floated around the Internet for a long time, and I think it would be worth bringing to this floor. Very, very human.

And as I listened to Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from New Jersey, I have to reflect back on our dear departed friend and colleague, Henry Hyde, who was a stalwart on the life issue. And I wrote this down from the back of the program at his funeral in Chicago that day. His last day on this Earth was November 29, 2007. And I think it's a good place, Mr. Speaker, to close this special order with a quote from Henry Hyde. And he said this:

"When the time comes, as it surely will, when we face that awesome moment, the final judgment, I've often thought, as Fulton Sheen wrote, that it's a terrible moment of loneliness. You have no advocates. You are there alone, standing before God. And a terror will rip through your soul like nothing you can imagine. But I really think that those in the pro-life movement will not be alone. I think there will be a chorus of voices that are not heard in this world that will be heard in the next, beautifully and clearly. And they will plead for everyone who has been in this movement, they will say to God, spare him because he loved us, and God will look at you and say not did you succeed, but did you try."

Mr. Speaker, I will yield back.

□ 2145

THE CONCERN OF AMERICA'S FUTURE DIRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I appreciate the impassioned gentlemen and their commitment to a pro-life agenda. I truly do.

I stand tonight and rise because of my concern about the direction of this country. I was elected here as a freshman. I did not create this problem in Washington, D.C., but I am here to help clean it up. We have the greatest opportunities ahead of us. The United States of America is the single greatest country on the face of the planet, and every time we are faced with a challenge, we overcome the obstacles that are thrown ahead of us. I would like to see our government get out of the way and stop being an impediment. I want to make sure that it is the American entrepreneur who is emboldened. It has always been the American entrepreneur who has driven this country forward.

As I rise today, my concern is that often what we hear and see in Washington, D.C., is not a reflection of the reality. The rhetoric has been very strong, but with all due respect to our President, of whom I have the greatest admiration—he is a great success story—what I hear and what I see tend to be two different things. There has been some good work done by Phil Kerpen of the Americans for Prosperity. I appreciate the work that he has done. I want to touch on a few points that I have great concern about.

We were promised by this administration and by the Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we would have this sunlight before signing things. In this body right here, the House Republicans and Democrats unanimously passed a resolution that said we would have 48 hours to review a bill before we would sign it. Yet, shortly thereafter, the single largest spending bill in the history of the United States passed out of the Rules Committee. It was just around midnight when we got the final copy of the bill, the so-called "stimulus bill." Just over 13 hours later, we had to vote on it. That is absolutely the wrong direction.

Then candidate Barack Obama said, "Too often, bills are rushed through Congress and to the President before the public has the opportunity to review them. As President, Obama will not sign any nonemergency bill without giving the American public an opportunity to review and comment on the White House Web site for 5 days." That does not happen on a regular basis, and it is wrong. It needs to change. We need to live up to those campaign commitments. They are not happening now.

The American people were promised that lobbyists would not be participants in this administration. On the Barack Obama Web site, it says, "No political appointees in an Obama-Biden administration will be permitted to work on regulations or contracts directly and substantially related to their prior employer for 2 years, and no political appointee will be able to lobby the executive branch after leaving government service during the remainder of the administration." That